

# The Solicitors' Journal & Reporter.

## VOLUME XI.

*The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—Town, 26s.; Country, 28s., with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage.*

*Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d.; half law calf, 4s. 6d.*

*All Letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer, though not necessarily for publication.*

*Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Provinces, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.*

### The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, NOVEMBER 3, 1866.

YESTERDAY, being the first day of Michaelmas Term, the learned judges sat at Westminster, where they arrived about a quarter to two o'clock. The Lords Justices, as has been customary for some time past, did not sit, and Vice-Chancellor Wood occupied their Lordships' Court. There were several motions in winding-up matters. In Vice-Chancellor Kindersley's Court the new Attorney-General (Mr. Rolfe) said he had two motions in Overend, Gurney, & Co. (Limited) to strike contributories off the list, and asked that the matter might stand till Thursday next, there having been an arrangement made with the liquidators that there should be no enforcement of the call in the meantime.

The following gentlemen, members of the Common Law Bar, having been appointed Queen's Counsel, were this day called within the bar:—J. B. Maule, called in 1847, R. S. Sowler, called in 1842, T. Jones, called in 1845, C. E. Pollock, called in 1842, W. A. Mundell, called in 1847, R. Garth, called in 1847, Esqs., Sir G. E. Honyman, Bart., called in 1849, and J. R. Quain, Esq., called in 1851.

MICHAELMAS TERM is anticipated to be a very busy one, both in equity and common law. There are sixty-four appeals and a long list of cases ready for hearing in the several Chancery Courts. At common law the arrears number 133, of which eighty are in the Queen's Bench, thirty-three in the Common Pleas, and twenty in the Exchequer. In the Queen's Bench there are of new trials four for judgment and eighteen for argument, two rules in the special paper for judgment and fifty-five for argument, besides one enlarged rule. In the Common Pleas there are two enlarged rules, seven for new trials, five matters standing for judgment, and nineteen demurrers set down for hearing; while in the Exchequer there are four errors and appeals, and on the special paper seven rules for argument, in addition to which there are of new trials one for judgment and eight for argument.

WE UNDERSTAND that the Master of the Rolls will give judgment in the case of the *Bishop of Natal v.*

*Gladstone*, on Tuesday next the 6th instant, at 10 o'clock. This suit relates, as will be recollected, to the recovery by the Bishop from the trustees of the Colonial Bishops Fund of the arrears of his stipend, which has been suspended since the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, denying the metropolitan jurisdiction of the Bishop of Capetown over the Bishop of Natal.

IN CONSEQUENCE of the state of the work in Vice-Chancellor Stuart's chambers, a third chief clerk has been appointed to that department. This new post has been conferred upon Mr. Henry Francis Church, of the firm of Church & Son, of Bedford-row. Mr. Church was admitted in 1846, and there is little doubt that his appointment will be looked upon with approbation by those who know his character and attainments.

LAST MONDAY was the commencement of a busy sittings before the Chief Clerks in the Court of Chancery. There was a crowded attendance at the chambers of the Master of the Rolls, and also at Vice-Chancellor Kindersley's. At the former an application was made in the Continental Bank Corporation by a number of clerks of the establishment who had been transferred to the Mediterranean Bank. They claimed to prove for want of notice, but the Chief Clerk (Mr. Church) decided against them. At the chambers of Vice-Chancellor Kindersley an order was made in the case of Overend, Gurney, & Co., to enforce the call, but the order was suspended till Friday afternoon, when the Vice-Chancellor would hear the case.

YESTERDAY was the day appointed by the Vice-Chancellor Stuart for the hearing by the Court of the case of two of the shareholders in Overend, Gurney, & Co. (Limited), a short account of the previous proceedings in which appears in another column. Great interest continues to be taken by the public in this important matter, and the result of the proceedings before the Court in term will be eagerly awaited on all sides. In the meantime the Vacation proceedings before the Chief Clerk have been amply discussed by our contemporaries, and in particular the proceedings before Mr. Hall on the 18th ult. have been made the subject of rather angry comments. An application was made on that day, on behalf of the official liquidators, for the usual four-day order to enforce payment of the call from twelve contributories. The application was opposed on behalf of the Defence Association, and an adjournment asked until to-day. It will be remembered that on the 2nd ult. the Vice-Chancellor, upon an application made to him by Mr. Swanston, on behalf of Messrs. Peake & Dundas, suspended the drawing up of the order until this day, in order to give them an opportunity of bringing their case before the Court in Term. Mr. Hall, on the 18th, declined to adjourn the twelve summonses, and this refusal on his part has been strongly reprobated, while the issue of the twelve summonses has been compared to a contempt of Court.

Respecting the question of adjournment it was laid down by the Lords Justices, *In re Agriculturist Cattle Insurance Company*, 9 W. R. 682, that parties have a right to have their cases argued before the judge if they so please. We presume, therefore, that the refusal of the Chief Clerk was a refusal to adjourn the question for a future hearing before himself, a refusal which it would be in his power to make; as to its expediency we offer no opinion. As to the comparison of the issue of the summonses to a contempt of court, those who write thus are exposing themselves to a charge of ignorance or folly in their eagerness to express their disapprobation. The Vice-Chancellor, as we have said, did on the 3rd suspend generally the order for enforcing the call, but on a subsequent application by the official liquidators he limited the suspension so as to be in favour of Messrs. Peake & Dundas alone. The official liquidators were thus at liberty to proceed against all other contributories, and it was open to those who objected to imitate Messrs. Peake & Dundas and apply to the Vice-Chancellor. However, the matter is now before the judge himself, and instead of the amenities which have been exchanged before the Chief Clerk, we shall now have more formal and regular proceedings to rely upon. All must rejoice that this much vexed matter should at length be submitted to the judge.

WE STATED LAST WEEK that, after a careful search, we had been unable to find any instance, in the present century at all events, of two equity lawyers having held as colleagues the offices of Attorney and Solicitor-General. In correction of this assertion a correspondent has drawn our attention to the case Sir Arthur Pigott and Sir Samuel Romilly, who were colleagues in those offices in Mr. Fox's short administration, 1806-7, and were (he says) both equity lawyers. He is, however, mistaken. Romilly practised in equity, and in the *Law List* of 1805 is described as "equity draftsman." Pigott, in the same official work, is simply described as of the "Home Circuit." Such a description indicates that his practice was mainly at common law. It is not unusual, it is true, for equity barristers to go circuit, but the custom of so doing has never been adopted by men of long standing and distinction. But Pigott remained a member of the Home Circuit up to the time of his appointment as Attorney-General, and therefore, although it is true that his name frequently appears in "Vesey" as appearing in the Court of Chancery, it may, we think, be fairly presumed that he was a common law rather than an equity lawyer.

THE EVENING CLASSES on law at University College, London, to the establishment of which we recently drew attention, have now been formed. We are glad to learn that there is every prospect, judging from the number of students who have entered their names, of the classes proving successful. Although legal education is no longer neglected either in the Inns of Court or by the Incorporated Law Society, it still remains desirable that students of the law should be offered the opportunity of attending college lectures, at which a systematic course of instruction may be obtained. The great defect in the legal training, both of barristers and solicitors, has hitherto been its exclusively professional character. But something more, besides an accurate acquaintance with points of practice, and with the points of principle arising in every day legal work, is necessary to make a man a sound lawyer. His education, to be effective, should not, in the first instance, be directed exclusively to this or that professional object, but should be "liberal." It is this liberal education which the authorities of University College are endeavouring to supply, and that their efforts are neither uncalled for nor unappreciated, the attendance of law students at the newly-instituted lectures sufficiently proves.

A SHARP PUNISHMENT has been fixed upon by Mr. Commissioner Kerr for the non-attendance of witnesses at the Central Criminal Court. Upon the Commissioner taking his seat on the 25th of October, several cases were called on, and the witnesses and prosecutors were not then in attendance. The learned Commissioner said he had come to the determination for the future if witnesses and prosecutors were not present at the sitting of the Court, to order the case to stand until the following day and not to allow any expenses. This, no doubt, will prove effectual.

A VERY IMPORTANT resolution recently arrived at by the justices of the county of Surrey assembled in Quarter Sessions at Kingston will be hailed with satisfaction, not only by those members of the profession who have frequently suffered from the inconvenience, but also by their clients, who have suffered the expense of the arrangements which are now altered. It is a well-known fact that at the Surrey Quarter Sessions, which are held, not only at Newington, but also at Reigate, Guildford, and Kingston, the great majority of cases arise within the metropolitan districts and that complaints are frequently made of the great expense incurred in taking witnesses and prisoners to these comparatively distant places when such cases could very well be disposed of at a more moderate expense at the Newington Sessions House. To Mr. Cubitt, M.P., are due our thanks for the resolution recently adopted on his motion:—"That after the October sessions this year all the criminal and judicial business shall be transacted at the Newington sessions, and adjournments, and no other than county business, at Reigate, Guildford, and Kingston." There can be no question that this decision is one of great importance, and that it will operate to prevent great inconvenience and to save expense. Doubtless there will be some hardship to those who will, under the altered system, be compelled to attend at Newington from the outlying districts of the county, but especially in these days of railways it is by far a less evil that a small number should be exposed to this hardship than that a very large number should unnecessarily be sent into the country, and on that ground alone it must be allowed that the decision of the Surrey justices introduces a great improvement on their previous practice. Whether it might not be possible still further to improve upon the new system is a matter of some doubt, and for the present, at least, we are willing to accept the proffered boon without sanctioning too closely the exact shape it has assumed.

ON TUESDAY MORNING Mr. T. H. Tilly, solicitor, of Falmouth, died from the effects of a fall from his horse on the previous evening. The unfortunate gentleman was discovered by Captain Barber and another gentleman lying on the road about two miles from Falmouth in a state of insensibility, and bleeding from the head and other parts of the body. Prompt assistance was rendered, but the medical gentleman at once pronounced the case to be hopeless, and the sufferer, who had received a severe concussion of the brain, died on Tuesday morning.

MR. CHATTERTON, the new Solicitor-General for Ireland, is to be returned for the University of Dublin without any opposition. Mr. Joy, Q.C., the only other candidate, has signified his intention of retiring, owing, he says, to his reluctance to interfere with the arrangements of the Government. He "will wait for the next vacancy."

TO-DAY'S LIST OF PETITIONS in the Rolls Court contains the curious feature that out of sixty-seven petitions no less than forty-five are in matters connected with limited liability companies. If this is the proportion the winding-up business of this branch of the court

bears to the remainder, endless accumulations of arrears will, in a very short time, put a stop to the legitimate business of the chief clerks.

IT IS WITH GREAT REGRET we announce the sudden death of Thomas Phinn, Esq., Q.C., who expired on Wednesday evening last about seven o'clock, apparently of some spasm or other similar affection of the heart. Mr. Phinn was the son of the late eminent Bath physician of that name, and was called to the bar by the Hon. Society of the Inner Temple in Michaelmas Term, 1840, and was a member of the Western Circuit. He was for some years Member of Parliament for Bath, and was appointed permanent secretary to the Admiralty by Lord Aberdeen's Government, an office which he afterwards resigned, and returned to the bar, where he had a leading practice before Parliamentary committees. He had been, before his appointment as secretary, standing counsel to the Board of Admiralty, an office in which he was succeeded by Sir Robert (then Mr.) Collier, and to which he was re-appointed when Mr. Collier became Solicitor-General. He was also recorder for Devonport and Plymouth, and Judge-Advocate of the Fleet. At the last general election he was an unsuccessful candidate for the representation of Devonport.

THE APPOINTMENTS of the Right Hon. John Edward Walsh to be Keeper or Master of the Rolls and Records of the Court of Chancery in Ireland; Sir Hugh McCalmont Cairns, to be a judge of the Court of Appeal in Chancery, in the room of the Right Hon. Sir James Lewis Knight Bruce, resigned; and of Mr. Rolt, to be Her Majesty's Attorney-General in all Her Majesty's Courts of Record in England; have appeared in the *London Gazette*.

#### WITCHCRAFT AND THE MAGISTRACY.

There is a wide difference between drawing attention, as we feel it our duty to do, to the occasional blunders and errors of judgment of the unpaid magistracy, and deducing from them arguments against the efficiency of that body. Since the time that a fourth estate has been created, whose duty is to supply the reading public with information or amusement, the tendency has been to bring into prominence particular incidents and to throw more into the background the routine of everyday occurrences. Whatever the shortcomings of the magistracy may be, and however prominently they may be brought forward, the real but unpretending usefulness of that body should not be lost sight of.

It is not, therefore, with any view to decry their services, or to point any moral but that derived from the story itself, that we call attention to the following account, which appeared in the *Times* of Saturday, the 27th of October, headed "Witchcraft in Nottinghamshire," and which we give in an abbreviated form:—At the Retford Petty Sessions a charge of assault was preferred by an agricultural labourer against a fellow-servant. The complainant's evidence was that the defendant fancied that something was amiss with the horses, and charged complainant with bewitching them, and frequently threatened him. On the day of the assault complainant was so frightened that he went over to Sturton to tell his father. On his return, having also told his master, he was sent by the latter to the defendant, who asked him where he had been, and on hearing, after saying that complainant had some witchcraft about him, began to beat and strike him about the head, face, and neck with the thick end of the whip-stock unmercifully. The defendant said it was all true, that complainant had been bewitching the horses, but he did not do it willingly, he was made by another party; and as defendant had heard that if he got dragon's blood and gave some to the horses when so bewitched, they would be relieved; he had done so and found it correct. He had done it in various ways and several times when he had seen the horses affected on complainant coming into

the stable. He produced a small tin canister in which a quantity of the powder was kept. He also stated that he had got some charms which he was told would keep the witch out of the stables, and he had put them in a corner. They were given him by a man at the railway station who wrote them out of a book. The charm was as follows:—

Omnes spiritus laudent Dominum  
Misericordiam habe Deus  
Desinetur Inimicus D.V.

Defendant also admitted he had told complainant that he should draw blood if he continued to use witchcraft. The bench wished to hear what Mr. Ellis, the master, had to say about his man, and were told by him, as also by a previous master, that he was a good servant, that they paid no attention to his notions about witchcraft, and that he was right enough. The bench told Mr. Ellis that they did not think his property or the boy's life safe with such a man, and suggested that complainant had better leave his service, which Mr. Ellis ultimately agreed to, and to pay his wages. After consulting together for some time, the bench ordered defendant to pay £2 fine and costs. On being told the decision defendant said, "There's witching the same now as ever there was, only they durst not show it; and there's the same books as there always was." After he had paid the above amount, another copy of the so-called charms was found in defendant's watch-case, and so sincere was his belief in their virtue, that on finding they were in court, he stated to a police-officer "He would sooner give £2 more than lose them." They were given to him, and he then left the court. Complainant was also paid his wages and he left his situation.

There are, in this most extraordinary report, what appear to us to be two very grave errors on the part of the bench of magistrates. Why they should have recommended that the complainant, in addition to the serious injuries that had been inflicted on him, should be dismissed from service, is a perfect mystery. If, however, as would appear from the context, the recommendation was that the defendant should be dismissed, the error on the part of the magistrates in departing from their own province was even more serious. If the fact of his being dismissed was to influence the severity of the sentence passed on the defendant, such a course, with regard to a man pronounced to be unsafe, was an injury to the public; if it was not to have that effect it was unjust to the man himself. There are very few instances in which it is safe to depart from the rule that the punishment should be proportioned to the magnitude of the crime, and not to its effect on the criminal. But there is a second and very serious evil in this case, and that is the very inadequate nature of the punishment inflicted. To fine a man two pounds and costs for beating another "about the head, face, and neck with the thick end of a whip-stock unmercifully," is, under any circumstances, a gross miscarriage of justice. In this case the evil is aggravated by the circumstances of the case. Few who are unacquainted with the rural population, especially of the west of England, would credit the extent to which a belief in witches and witchcraft still survives, in spite of the efforts that have been, and are being, made to promote the moral and intellectual improvement of the masses. A case occurred within our own knowledge where a working-man assaulted a woman and cut her arm with a crooked nail; his defence was that she had "witched" him, and that he did it to draw blood and so free himself from the spell. The woman was much hurt and frightened, but the magistrates fined the man *sixpence*, no doubt from the mistaken notion that the man thinking himself to be in the right ought not to be dealt hardly with. The prisoner himself explained the sentence by saying—"Ah! they knew she was a witch." Whether the punishment he deserved, but did not get, would have altered his view of witchcraft it is impossible to say. At least it might have made him keep his belief to himself, and adopt some



other remedy than the one he used. The effect of such inadequate sentences will naturally be to strengthen the conviction of the lower classes of the truth of these superstitions, by giving colour to the assertion that their superiors in position and education share their delusions. Thus to the evil effect produced by visiting personal and dangerous violence with a fine or light term of imprisonment will be added the mischief of giving direct encouragement to the superstitious belief from which these acts of violence arise.

#### LITERARY CRITICISM AND THE LAW OF LIBEL.

There is no part of the law which is more important to the general interests of the literary community than the law of libel, and yet some branches of it, which ought to be fixed and well understood, are frequently dealt with by text writers and judges in a very unsatisfactory manner. All literary men are interested in knowing exactly to what extent a critic is justified in remarking on the books or other literary productions of his contemporaries. They are interested either as being critics themselves, or as being authors who are subject to the observations of critics. And, indeed, the interest felt on this subject is not confined to authors and critics, but may be said to be shared by all those who take any interest in literary matters.

There is necessarily some difficulty in dealing with this question in consequence of the peculiar nature of the subject, and it is sometimes not easy to decide whether the most disparaging comments on a book can properly be considered, in the strict sense of the word, libels upon the author. It is not so much that the law itself is doubtful or unsettled, but the decisions on this subject have too often been given in so crude and unscientific a form, that it is difficult to gather what has been the ground upon which the judgments in those cases have been given. The rule usually laid down for ascertaining whether or not a particular writing is a libel is, that "any writing calculated to degrade or disparage a particular person and hold him up to hatred, ridicule, or contempt, is actionable unless there is some special ground of defence." Under this rule it is clear that if a criticism upon a publication contains observations not connected with the work, and personally defamatory to the author, it will be *prima facie* actionable. It seems also to be settled that if a person publish, in writing, matter disparaging the property of another, abstaining altogether from any personal reflections, no action can be maintained unless the plaintiff proves that he has sustained special damage therefrom. Such observations on the goods of another do not seem to be, properly speaking, libellous, as no person is thereby defamed. The action which lies in this case is an action in the nature of an action for slander of title, in which, as is well known, special damage is necessary in order to give a right of action to the owner of the property, the title to which has been slandered. The question may well be asked under which of the two foregoing classes of cases do comments on books fall when the criticism is directed solely and entirely to a published work of the plaintiff.

On the one hand it might be argued that the copyright of books forms a well-recognized species of property, and that anything written concerning such property ought not to be actionable unless some special damage be shown; and that if this is law with respect to comments on ordinary property, it ought to be still more so when any published literary work is in question which may be obtained and read by anyone who wishes to judge of its contents for himself. But on the other side it must be remembered that there is one obvious difference between comments on books and remarks upon other species of property. If a trader publish that the goods of a rival are of a bad quality, he does not thereby necessarily impute any dishonesty or even carelessness or indifference in his business to the owner of those goods, as they may have been bought under circumstances which might fairly have induced anyone to believe that they were of

the very best quality. If, however, a critic write of a book that it is stupid or immoral, or make any such comments, it is difficult to avoid coming to the conclusion that if those comments are true the author of the book must be stupid, or immoral, or ignorant, as the case may be. A book is so directly the product of the author's mind that one can hardly form an opinion about the former without at the same time judging the latter. A disparagement of the book, therefore, seems almost necessarily a disparagement of the author. For these reasons it appears that criticisms upon books must be looked upon rather as being directed to persons than to property. Exactly the same principle may become applicable to observations on any other kind of property. For instance, to write of a wine merchant that his wine is poisoned might be libellous, because it might be a serious charge upon the personal character of the merchant. Another reason might also be urged for the conclusion that adverse comments on literary works are in the nature of personal reflections on the author. In certain cases the publication of a book may be an indictable offence, as, for instance, if the book be of a seditious or blasphemous nature. If, then, a critic writes that a particular book is seditious or blasphemous, he, it may almost be said, directly accuses the author of having committed an indictable offence, and such an accusation, even if made verbally, might be a ground of action without any proof of special damage. It would seem, therefore, that it is *prima facie* libellous to write of a book that it is stupid or immoral, &c., and to do so would expose the writer to an action of libel.

Such a rule as this would very much impede the freedom of all criticism, but for the exception now clearly recognized that a defendant may show that an alleged libel is a fair criticism on a literary work of the plaintiff. This is sometimes expressed by saying that criticisms of this sort are like privileged communications, and that the writer of them is not liable to an action unless malice on his part be shown, as well as that his statements are not true. But the best view to take of this defence seems to be that it is peculiar to writings of this sort, and that, strictly speaking, the question of truth or untruth, malice or no malice, is not raised thereby. The question for the jury ought to be, is it a criticism on a literary work? or, is that form of writing merely adopted as a vehicle for a personal attack upon the author? But, although it is easy to lay down an exception of this sort, it is not easy to apply it in practice. The application of the rule, moreover, is rendered more difficult by the way in which the jury are often told that they must say whether it is a fair and *bona fide* criticism? whether it exceeds the bounds of fair comment? whether the defendant was actuated by a malicious feeling towards the plaintiff? &c. Of course some such question as this must be left to the jury, but it should be left to them in the plainest and simplest way. A jury during the hurry of a *nisi prius* trial have but little opportunity to enter into minute questions as to the true limits of criticism, &c. And, apart from this, the question put to the jury too often is one which is really a mere matter of taste and opinion.

The general rules of law on this subject are fully well fixed, but the matter is frequently dealt with in a confused manner. It would be very desirable that it should be recognized that criticisms are not privileged communications in the ordinary and technical sense, and that there is no question of truth or falsehood, of malice or no malice on the part of the critic. When this view of the question is once adopted, the only matter to be decided in each case will be—"Is the alleged libel of such a description as may fairly be considered a criticism (whether true or false, whether malicious or not is immaterial) upon a book, or is it really only an attack upon the author personally under the disguise of a literary critique?" This rule would exclude the question of the fairness or *bona fides* of the criticism, and would give a jury a definite fact as the subject for their deliberations. They would be told by the judge that if the



alleged libel could by any reasonable construction be considered as a criticism, however severe, upon a publication of the plaintiff's, that the defendant would be entitled to their verdict, whether he were actuated by malice or not, or whether his judgment upon the plaintiff's work were correct or utterly erroneous; of course if comments upon a literary work were so extravagant that they could not fairly be considered as a criticism at all, and were at the same time defamatory, the plaintiff under the above ruling would be entitled to a verdict. The jury in some cases might, no doubt, have great difficulty in coming to a satisfactory decision, but, we believe, that the ruling above suggested would be the best way of putting the matter to them in all cases, and would certainly make their duties more easy of performance than they usually are at present on trials for libels of this description.

**PRIVATE BILL LEGISLATION FOR THE SESSION OF 1867.**—The business of the coming session will be lighter than it has been for some years past; nevertheless, there is a certain amount of business to be transacted; and it might be as well to remind all who intend to apply for Parliamentary powers, that Friday, November the 16th, is the last day for giving the first of the three notices required.

## COMMON LAW.

### RECENT CASES ON INTERROGATORIES.

The cases on the admissibility of interrogatories that have arisen in the common law courts during the past year, and are reported in the 14 *Weekly Reporter*, though not numerous, are of some permanent interest. None of them lay down any new rules for guidance, but several of the decided cases, and the rules that have been, or might be supposed to follow from them, have been modified in a manner which seems to deserve more than a passing notice. Disposing first of the decisions which merely follow, without altering or adding to already decided cases, we notice the case of *Jourdain v. Palmer*, 14 W. R. 283, from which it appears that "to entitle a party to interrogatories, it is not enough that he is entitled to discovery in equity on some ground and for some purpose, it must be upon the same ground and for the same purpose for which the interrogatories are sought." This proposition might pass as a truism if the ground on which the party is entitled to discovery in equity, and that on which he seeks to administer interrogatories are so distinct that they can be separated, which would rarely happen; but the case does not help us to determine the intermediate position where the two things are neither identical nor entirely separate. Another point arising in the same case will be considered below.

In *Hawkins v. Carr*, 14 W. R. 138, we find that "in allowing interrogatories under the Common Law Procedure Act, 1854, s. 51, the Court will follow the practice in chancery"—a proposition which, although it has been more than once contested, would not seem to have required a considered judgment to establish it.

Three questions of considerable importance have been discussed as to the admissibility of interrogatories in the following cases:—Where it is asserted that the answers would tend to criminate the party interrogated; where the defendant in an action of trover seeks to discover the title of the plaintiff; and where the defendant seeks to discover the amount of damages incurred by the plaintiff. We propose to consider these questions in connection with the cases in which they arise, and then to offer a few remarks on this subject.

The first of these questions was raised in *Bickford v. D'Arcy*, 14 W. R. 900, in which case *Baker v. Lane* was, as the reporter politely phrases it, "explained." In *Baker v. Lane*, the Court appears to have decided that questions tending to criminate ought not to be allowed, and we must allow that the considered, though brief, judgment of the Court, coupled with the elaborate argument on either side, seems to point to that conclusion.

But this is now explained: "the true reason," says Pollock, C.B., "of our disallowing the interrogatories there was that the questions were not in our opinion put *bonâ fide*." It is to be regretted that the Court did not say so in giving judgment in *Baker v. Lane*, but at any rate it may be assumed till further explanation that the rule is re-established that the mere fact that answers to interrogatories would tend to criminate is not in itself a sufficient reason for disallowing them. In connection with this point is the case of *Atkinson v. Fosbrook*, p. 832, an action for slander, in which the Court of Queen's Bench allowed the plaintiff to administer interrogatories to the defendant in order to discover the exact words used. The case of *Stern v. Sevestopulo*, 11 W. R. 862, was quoted as an authority to the contrary effect, but the Court, while admitting the rule there laid down—that, in general, interrogatories will not be allowed in an action of slander—established as an exception the case in which a plaintiff, without the aid of interrogatories, would be unable to ascertain the exact words used where it appears *prima facie* that some slanderous words have been used.

In *Finney v. Forward*, 14 W. R. 85, the defendant in an action of trover desired to exhibit interrogatories to the plaintiff for the purpose of ascertaining the plaintiff's title to the goods for which he was suing. The Court refused to allow them to be administered, though pressed with the case of *Hicroft v. Fletcher*, 4 W. R. 263, and other cases in which, in ejectment, interrogatories as to the title of the plaintiff had been allowed. "It may be," said Pollock, C.B., in the course of the case, "that the reason why the Court in those cases allowed interrogatories to be exhibited to the plaintiff arose from the peculiar nature of an action of ejectment. The Court will not extend that rule to actions of trover." It is not easy to see any real distinction between the case of a person in possession of land and one who has had possession of a chattel for a length of time. Indeed it seems almost as if the argument might be reversed and the peculiar nature of an action of ejectment with the intricacies of title and the facility for finding flaws adduced as a reason against the administration of interrogatories in ejectment. In the words of the same learned judge "the distinction which the law has at all times made between real property and personal property may in part have arisen from this: that if a man has land he is considered as holding it under a grant from the Crown; if he has personal property he holds it directly or indirectly by reason of some contract," and if this be so, permission to interrogate the plaintiff in an action of trover as to his title, could hardly be called an extension of the rule relating to ejectments. We may be permitted to doubt whether, on further consideration, this case too may not be explained and a restriction, of which the utility is doubtful, removed.

The case of *Jourdain v. Palmer*, p. 283, referred to above on a minor point, questions, if it does not overrule, *Wright v. Goodlake*, 13 W. R. 349. In *Wright v. Goodlake*, the Court of Exchequer allowed interrogatories to be put to a plaintiff to ascertain the true measure of the damages he had sustained, and so guide the defendant as to the amount he might fairly pay into court, at least, this is the deduction that is naturally drawn from the fact that the Court saw no reason why the interrogatories should not be administered. In *Jourdain v. Palmer*, however, the same Court "doubt whether *Wright v. Goodlake* can be followed in all cases apparently similar to it," and since "equity would only grant a discovery for the purpose of taking the accounts and settling the whole matter between the plaintiff and defendant (but that is a thing which we have no power to do, and is a purpose wholly foreign to this action)," the Court refused to aid the defendant. These results may be thus briefly summed up: the rule on which the case of *Baker v. Lane* throw some doubt is re-established, that the mere fact that answers to interrogatories would tend to

criminate is not in itself a sufficient reason for disallowing them. In actions for slander the Court, as a rule, will not allow interrogation as to the words used, but this rule is not inflexible. The defendant in an action of trover will not be allowed to interrogate the plaintiff as to his title, and a defendant, the case of *Wright v. Goodlake* notwithstanding, will not be permitted to discover, by interrogating the plaintiff, what amount of damage he has sustained. The section of the Common Law Procedure Act, allowing interrogatories to be administered on which the cases we have mentioned above arose has, without doubt, worked well whenever it has been allowed to work at all. The conflicting decisions and obscurity in which the subject is involved owe their origin to several causes, one of which we cannot help thinking is the common evil—the want of written judgments—and further, the brevity with which even in considered judgments the subject is treated. Where, after an elaborate argument, the Court allow or disallow interrogatories in so many words without explanation of the reasons that influence it, and without any limitation to the particular case (by reference, for instance, to its discretion), the conclusion is natural that the arguments of the counsel who has succeeded are correct, and a general rule is deduced on which the profession act until, perhaps, an opportunity for explanation shows that the Court decided on different or even opposite grounds. Hence part of the confusion in which the subject is involved; but we think that there is an evil somewhat deeper than this, and that the action of the statute has been much more restricted in practice than was the intention of the original framers.

The section enacts that either party may, by leave of the Court or a judge, deliver to the opposite party or his attorney (provided such party, if not a body corporate, would be liable to be called and examined as a witness upon such matter) interrogatories in writing upon any matter as to which discovery may be sought, and provides that a party omitting, without just cause, sufficiently to answer shall be deemed to have committed a contempt of court. There is, therefore, a discretion in every case as to allowing interrogatories, and this, while it accounts, to a certain extent, for the many conflicting cases, increases the difficulty of the task of criticising the decisions on the subject; but in fact in this, as in so many cases, the exercise of a discretion of to-day becomes the precedent of to-morrow, and in that guise fair subject for comment. The course pursued with respect to interrogatories has, as it appears to us, rather cramped the action of the statute, for instance, it is made a ground, in a passage already partially quoted, for refusing to allow interrogatories to be administered that "it has been held with regard to equitable pleas, that they are not good unless they go completely to the root of the matter and finally dispose of the right of the parties, and in this case equity will only grant a discovery for the purpose of taking the accounts and settling the whole matter between the plaintiff and defendant. But that is a thing we have no power to do, and is a purpose wholly foreign to this action." The analogy here suggested illustrates the objection we would raise. To simplify and facilitate the trial of an action at law a statute is passed, enabling that to be done which before could only be done in a court of equity, namely, to plead an equitable plea or to ask for discovery, and though it may be reasonable or even necessary that these new powers should follow the general practice adopted in similar cases in equity, it by no means follows their effect should be restricted by adopting all the rules of equity, whether applicable to the particular case or not. In an action the object is to obtain an adjustment of the particular claim; and an equitable plea or equitable right to discovery may achieve that object and carry out the wishes of the Legislature by saving time and diminishing costs, though under different circumstances, and in a suit in equity, they might, unaided, fail to secure the objects of that suit. With regard to equitable pleas the matter is now perhaps beyond the control of

the judges, but in the matter of interrogatories it is still in their hands. We should rejoice to see in practice a more liberal construction put upon the very wide words of the statute, and interrogatories allowed to be administered in many cases in which they are not at present. More liberality in allowing interrogatories would, we believe, be followed by several beneficial results. One of these would be to cast on the person interrogated the responsibility of replying or not as he might be advised. The effect of raising the objection to the question being put, and not to its being answered, is, that the ingenuity of his advisers is taxed to find some means of escaping from questions to answer, or even not to answer, which might damage the case irrespective of its real merits. If the rule were to allow interrogatories in the first instance, the matter must go beyond the legal advisers and reach the party himself, and with the responsibility of not answering thrown on him, the objections to answer and, in consequence, the obstructions to the working of the statute, would be greatly diminished. In some cases this view has been adopted, as in *Osborn v. The London Dock Company*, 10 Ex. 698, and *Chester v. Wortley*, 17 C. P. 410, where interrogatories were allowed to be administered on the ground that the objection to answer should come from the party himself when he has been sworn.

Were interrogatories allowed wherever they would facilitate the bringing an action to a close, and the discretion of the Court exercised "for the purpose only of seeing that the process of the Court is not abused," all *bond fide* objections to answering would be equally open to the party interrogated, and much more certainty would be introduced since an argument on the propriety of putting questions must, from the nature of the case, be more general than an argument on the propriety of answering them, as the latter will be referred much more closely to the particular case under discussion. We should thus avoid many of the conflicting decisions where a rule, adopted apparently to meet the substantial justice of a case, has to be modified to meet that of a subsequent case. It will be apparent that in a subject of so indefinite a nature and of such magnitude it would be impossible in our limits to do more than point out some of the most prominent advantages that would result from the change suggested. It certainly is a subject for regret that when the Legislature have been at the pains to offer facilities for the disposal of actions, their efforts should in any cases, however few, be restricted or rendered nugatory by fanciful analogies and attempts to assimilate two dissimilar things.

## COURTS.

### VICE-CHANCELLOR KINDERSLEY'S CHAMBERS.

Oct. 29.—*Overend, Gurney, & Co. (Limited)*.—This day an application was made by Mr. Denton (Maynard & Denton), as solicitor for the official liquidators, to enforce the call of £10 made by the vacation clerk of Vice-Chancellor Stuart. There was a crowded meeting on the occasion, and much excitement prevailed. Some hundreds of shareholders had been summoned. Since the matter has been before the public the money has freely been paid, and it was anticipated that the present application would save the liquidators from proceeding by way of attachment.

Mr. Gay (from the office of Mr. Dale) was for a depositor named Stephenson.

Messrs. Clark, Son, & Rawlins now appeared for members of the Defence Association, in the place of Messrs. Lewis & Lewis, who it was understood had resigned.

A considerable discussion took place. Mr. Denton asked for a four-day order. There were about 1400 contributories; many had paid, and he believed that of the great number summoned others would pay on it being seen that the Court would enforce the call.

On the part of the Defence Association fraud was alleged in the inception of the affair, and time was asked for a full investigation.

The CHIEF CLERK (Mr. Buckley) said the liquidators

were entitled to the order, and made an order accordingly, but it was arranged that the parties should raise the question before the Vice-Chancellor on Friday, and the order was suspended until that day.

#### MASTER OF THE ROLLS' CHAMBERS.

Oct. 29.—*The Birmingham Banking Co.*—The consideration of this case was resumed.

Mr. Robinson stated that he appeared on behalf of Mr. Brinsley, who had been appointed chairman of a meeting of those interested in the bank, and which had been called to consider what steps it might be advisable for them to take. The summons was for leave to attend, and for leave to inspect the books. What Mr. Brinsley asked for, on his own account, and on behalf of those whom he claimed to represent, was information. The property involved was very considerable in amount, being upwards of £2,000,000. He disclaimed the desire to make any charge against the official liquidators, but the majority of the contributories were anxious to ascertain the causes of the gross mismanagement which had brought the undertaking to its present state.

Mr. Burton opposed the application. He denied the right of Mr. Brinsley to assume to represent those on whose behalf he claimed to appear. The official liquidators who had been appointed were of a character to command the confidence of all concerned in the bank. They were willing to give all proper information, but he protested against the unnecessary increase of expense which would follow the granting of an order to inspect the books, apart from the delay and inconvenience which it would occasion.

The CHIEF CLERK said he must treat this as an application of Mr. Brinsley, in right of his position on the list of contributories, for liberty to attend, which he already had a right to do, so that that part of the application was superfluous; and also for leave to inspect. The latter question was one of considerable difficulty, and he should like to consider it very carefully, as it was likely to rule other cases of a similar kind. Therefore he would defer any declaration of opinion until Wednesday morning, and, if necessary, the question might be brought directly before the Master of the Rolls.

*The Continental Bank Corporation*—This case raised a question of some interest to bankers' clerks. Several clerks of the Continental Bank had gone to another bank, and yet they claimed three months' notice, according to their written agreement. There was no written agreement with the other bank.

The CHIEF CLERK held that, as the clerks were transferred, there was no break in the agreement, and they could not claim. It mattered not whether the second agreement was in writing. For any work done before the liquidation they would be paid in full, but not for an alleged want of notice.

The decision against the clerks affected a number of applicants.

Order accordingly.

*The Joint-Stock Discount Co. (Limited).*—Mr. Miller appeared in support of an application made on behalf of a large number of shareholders in the above company for an order to inspect the books of the company.

After some discussion,

The CHIEF CLERK declined to make an order, but granted a direction to inspect, the applicants to specify the documents they wanted, and to have liberty to apply to the Chief Clerk whenever occasion should arise.

There was also a second application at the instance of the same parties, to stay the payment of the call now made, on the ground that the liabilities to discharge which it has been made were incurred by the directors acting *ultra vires*.

The CHIEF CLERK declined to grant the postponement, but adjourned the consideration of the question for the personal opinion of the judge, remarking that the point was a new one. The matter will, therefore, come before the Master of the Rolls in a few days.

Oct. 31.—*Barned's Banking Co.*—To-day application was made to Mr. Church, on behalf of forty-five contributories, for leave to vary the certificate, notwithstanding the time had expired after its consideration by the judge, which by Order 35, Rule 52, of the Chancery Consolidation Act, was limited to eight days. In support *Howell v. Kightley*, 4 W. R. 477, and *Ashton v. Wood*, 5 W. R. 271, were relied upon. Forty-five affidavits were filed, all to the same effect, charging fraud, and alleging that the depositions of wit-

nesses examined before Mr. Whitbread, Special Examiner, were not filed till the 14th of September, when the facts became known to the applicants for the first time.

On the part of the official liquidators, fraud was denied, and also insolvency at the time of the bank's formation; and it was stated that the questions which had been submitted for answer by the applicants would involve an examination of the books, extending over a period of not less than three months, and cause useless expense.

A question was also raised as to whether the application should not be motion in court, instead of by demurring at chambers; but it was stated there was no case precisely bearing upon the point, and the two which had been quoted were the nearest approach to it.

The CHIEF CLERK.—It had not been the practice with him to grant such a summons as was asked for; but he would make inquiry upon the subject.

On the following morning Mr. CHURCH stated he found, upon inquiry, that such summonses had been issued in other branches, and therefore he should do so, but there would be one order drawn up on all the summonses, at the applicants' expense.

*J. Emanuel* for applicants.

*Freshfield & Co.* for liquidators.

Oct. 31.—*Barned's Banking Co.*—This case came on on an important question in "forty-five" summonses, raised on as many affidavits, the object being to vary the certificate of the Chief Clerk as to contributories. It was a point of considerable interest to shareholders in public companies.

Mr. Joel Emanuel, on the part of the forty-five shareholders, on the list, applied for a summons to vary the certificate as to the contributories, on the ground that they had been induced to take shares on a false or exaggerated prospectus coined by the directors. There had been a special examiner appointed, and on the evidence given he grounded his application, and that would open the second question, which would first have to be considered, and that was a rule of court which required all applications to be made within "eight days" of the certificate. Mr. Emanuel cited two cases in which leave had been given where the eight days had expired.

The fraud was denied on the part of the liquidators.

The CHIEF CLERK thought the first point was, as to this application being made by motion to the court or at chambers.

Mr. Emanuel admitted that it was so. All he could say was, that he had been unable to find any case on the point. He was, however, willing to go to the Court on motion.

The CHIEF CLERK said he would consider the question and give his judgment to-morrow. It was his impression that the application should be made to the court by motion and not by summons at chambers.

The decision accordingly stood adjourned.

Nov. 2.—*Re Joint-Stock Discount Co. (Limited).*—There were several summonses in this matter returnable before Mr. Hawkins at the Rolls.

On the part of the official liquidator, however, it was asked that they might stand adjourned till after *Sheppard's case*, which is now under appeal, is heard.

The CHIEF CLERK said he should be glad when *Sheppard's case* was decided, because he should then know what to do.

There were also some summonses for balance orders, but these were ordered to stand over.

The CHIEF CLERK stated that the Chief Clerks generally were about to hold a meeting at one o'clock, when a uniformity of practice throughout the offices would, no doubt, be established.

*Lawrance & Co.* for liquidators.

*Mackenzie & Co.; Bertram, Miller, & Co.; Sweeting;* for other parties.

#### COURT OF BANKRUPTCY.

(Before Mr. Commissioner WINSLOW.)

Oct. 16.—*In re Johnson.*—This case involved a novel point under the Copyright Act, the 25 & 26 Vict. c. 68. It was an application for release from custody by William Johnson, a debtor, who had executed a deed under the 192nd section of the Bankruptcy Act, 1861.

*Reed*, in support of the application.

*Bagley*, contra.

The debtor, who was described as a dealer in photographs and prints, of 28, Westbourne-grove, Bayswater, was detained in Whitecross-street prison under the following cir-



cumstances:—On the 28th of August eight summonses were returnable before the Marylebone police magistrates, in which Henry Graves of Pall Mall was the complainant, and the debtor was defendant, to recover damages in consequence of the defendant having “unlawfully repeated, copied, colourably imitated, or otherwise multiplied for sale or knowingly sold certain copies of engravings, the copyright whereof was the property of the complainant.” Upon the hearing of the summons eight penalties of £10 each, together with £3 3s. costs, were inflicted upon the defendant under the provisions of the 25 & 26 Vict. c. 68. On the 7th September, the defendant executed a deed under the 192nd section of the Bankruptcy Act, 1861, whereby he covenanted to pay to his creditors the sum of two shillings and sixpence in the pound on their respective debts by two equal instalments, on the 29th of December and the 29th of April next. On the 12th or 13th of September the defendant obtained his protection under the deed, and on the 10th of October he was arrested on a warrant issued on the 31st of August for one sum of £10 and £3 3s. costs. He produced to the officer who so arrested him his protection dated the 12th of September, but the officer refused to recognise it, and accordingly conveyed the debtor to Whitecross-street prison, where, notwithstanding his protection, he was still detained. The question was whether, under the circumstances, the arrest was valid, and

*Reed*, in support of the application, referred to several sections of the Copyright Act, for the purpose of showing that the penalty recoverable from the defendant was in the nature of a “debt,” and he contended that the defendant having obtained the protection of this Court could not be arrested for a “debt.” He submitted that the arrest was altogether illegal and that the Court would enforce its own protection by at once liberating the debtor. He referred also to the 112th section of the Bankrupt Law Consolidation Act, 1849, and the 149th, 198th, and 204th sections of the Bankruptcy Act, 1861.

Mr. Commissioner WINSLOW observed that there was no order of the Court giving the debtor protection.

*Reed*.—There is a certificate of protection by the Chief Registrar; moreover, the debtor is protected by statute (the 198th section of the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 134).

*Bagley* contended that the Court had no power whatever to interfere with the commitment of the magistrate, which could only be set aside by application to the Court of Queen’s Bench. Further, the debtor had been convicted of an offence, and the penalty was by way of punishment, and the estimate of it could not be considered as a debt. The words of the commitment were “and it was thereby adjudged that the said William Johnson for the said offence should forfeit £10,” &c. It was idle, therefore, to say that the penalty represented a debt due from the defendant.

The following case was cited.—*Bauerselman v. Langlands*, 13 W. R. 79.

The COURT, after considerable argument, reserved judgment.

Oct. 20.—His Honour now gave judgment upon this application for release from custody. After stating the facts his Honour said—The first question which appears to me to arise in the case is whether this Court has jurisdiction to deal with an application for release from custody by a debtor arrested notwithstanding the protection given by the 198th section; this would require me to state the reasons for my determination at much greater length than I purpose to do, if there were not decisions by which this Court is bound. In *Re Castleton*, 10 W. R. 851, the debtor was arrested by a creditor in defiance of the Chief Registrar’s certificate, and applied for his release to a commissioner of this court, who refused to interfere, but the Lords Justices reversed that decision and directed the debtor to be released. In the case of *Re Shettle*, 11 W. R. 45, on app. 159, Lord Justice Knight Bruce said he was of opinion that a commissioner had the jurisdiction in question, and Lord Justice Turner seemed to be of the same opinion. These cases have never, so far as I can discover, been overruled, and this Court is bound to act upon them. This Court having, then, jurisdiction to entertain an application of this nature, the next question is whether the debtor is entitled to protection against the claim of Mr Graves. Assuming for my present purpose that the requirements of the Act have been complied with, and that the deed is binding upon the dissenting as well as the assenting creditors, then by the 198th section no execution, sequestration, or other process against the debtor’s property in respect of any debt, and no process

against his person in respect of any debt, other than such process by writ or warrant as may be had against a debtor about to depart out of England, could be available to any creditor or the claimant without the leave of this Court; and the certificate of the Chief Registrar of the filing and registration of the deed was available to the debtor for all purposes as a protection in bankruptcy. The protection in bankruptcy which is here mentioned must be the protection which a bankrupt obtains by the 112th section of the Bankrupt Law Consolidation Act, 1849, and the freedom from arrest and imprisonment thereby given to a bankrupt is by the 198th section given to a debtor; and it appears to me that the Legislature intended the debtor should have this freedom from arrest until, by the agreement between the debtor and his creditors as expressed in the deed, he obtained a final release from his debts. The 112th section is divided into three parts—1. If the bankrupt be not in prison or custody at the date of the adjudication he shall be free from arrest or imprisonment by any creditor in coming to surrender, and after his surrender for certain periods set forth in the section. 2. A bankrupt in prison or custody under any process, attachment, execution, or sentence, may be brought up before this Court by warrant to surrender. 3. When any person who has been adjudged a bankrupt and has surrendered and obtained his protection from arrest is in prison or custody for debt at the time of obtaining such protection, the Court may, except in cases next hereinafter mentioned, order his immediate release, either absolutely or upon such conditions as it shall think fit. Provided always that the Court shall not order such release when it shall appear by any judgment order, commitment, or sentence under which the bankrupt is in prison or custody, and the pleadings and proceedings previously thereto, that he is in prison or custody for any debt contracted by reason *inter alia* of any prosecution against him by which he has been convicted of any offence. Construing the words “such release” in the third part of the section as applying to the release mentioned in the second part, which is, in fact, the only release mentioned in the section, it is evident that this Court could not have released the debtor if he had been arrested before the filing of the deed, for the date of the filing of the deed is similar to the date of the adjudication in bankruptcy, and it is quite clear the debtor has been convicted of an offence under the Copyright Act. But the ground of the application for the release of this debtor is, not the power given in express terms by the second part of the 112th section, but the fact that the debtor was protected at the time of his arrest, and I have never heard it contended that a bankrupt who has surrendered and obtained his protection is not entitled to freedom from arrest, although the judgment order, commitment, or sentence is in respect of a debt contracted in manner mentioned in the proviso at the end of the 112th section, though, if actually arrested before he gets his protection, he cannot be discharged under that section. If that be so, this debtor, having his protection as in bankruptcy, was free from arrest at the suit of Mr. Graves, notwithstanding he had committed an offence, provided he was arrested for a debt and Mr. Graves was a creditor or claimant within the meaning of the before mentioned 112th and 198th sections. For the purpose of ascertaining this it is necessary to look at the words of the Copyright Act. By that Act if any person not being the proprietor of any copyright shall imitate or copy for sale any painting, &c., without the consent of the proprietor, he shall for every such offence forfeit to the proprietor a sum not exceeding £10, and such penalty may be recovered by action against the party, or by summary proceeding before any two justices having jurisdiction where the party offending resides. Mr. Graves proceeded for the recovery of the penalties in the summary manner, and at the time of the filing of the deed he had obtained an order or orders that the debtor should forfeit and pay to him the sum of £80 and costs, and there being no sufficient goods of the debtor’s on which execution could be levied, he had obtained a warrant, which the magistrate was authorised to grant, that the debtor should be imprisoned for one month unless the penalty and costs should be sooner paid. Could Mr. Graves prove in bankruptcy for that sum as a debt? I think he could, and that so soon as he got his order he was in the position of a judgment creditor. The fact of the judgment being by a justice of the peace can make no difference, and although the judgment is recovered in respect of an offence, the offence is not a greater one than an assault or many other offences, the damages given by law in respect of

which become, when judgment is recovered, a debt proveable in bankruptcy and from which the bankrupt is entitled to protection: *Rees v. Stokes*, Cowp. 136; *Rees v. Wakefield*, 13 East. 190; *Rees v. Myers*, 1 Durn. & East. 265. The Copyright Act merely gave a speedy and inexpensive mode of recovering the damages, but they are only damages recovered by the party. Nor does the limitation of the imprisonment make any difference; the Legislature considered that an unlimited length of imprisonment was too severe a remedy for the recovery of so small a penalty, but no intimation is given of any intention that the creditor and debtor should not have the respective remedies given to them by the Bankruptcy Acts. I can find nothing to show that the debtor was not entitled to his freedom from arrest from the debt of Mr. Graves, and, being so entitled, he has a right to claim his release.

*Bagley* called the attention of the Court to the fact that the debtor had not ventured to swear that a majority in number, representing three-fourths in value, of the creditors had in writing assented to the deed. He desired to examine the debtor upon the subject.

*Reed* opposed an examination of the debtor.

The Court granted an appointment for an examination of the debtor.

Solicitors, *Pullen*; *J. Bowen May*.

(Before Mr. Registrar MURRAY.)

Oct. 30.—*In Re R. H. Gough*.—The bankrupt was an attorney and solicitor, practising in Parliament-street, Westminster. He was adjudicated upon a creditor's petition (that of Mr. Watkins, of Parliament-street). No statement of affairs has yet been filed, but the liabilities are estimated by Mr. Smart, the accountant, at from £10,000 to £15,000, a portion of which are said to have arisen in connection with various railway schemes. The good debts due to bankrupt are returned at £16,000.

This was a first meeting, and an assignee having been chosen a resolution was passed for winding-up the estate out of court by means of a deed of inspection.

Mr. *Terry* appeared for the petitioner.

Mr. *Lawrance* for the bankrupt.

(Before Mr. Commissioner GOULBURN.)

Nov. 1.—*In re A. W. Rixon*.—Mr. *Lawrance* appeared for the assignees.

Mr. Augustus William Rixon, solicitor, of 3, Westminster-chambers, and 33, Cannon-street, was adjudicated upon the petition of the official liquidator of the Joint-Stock Discount Company (Limited). His accounts, by Mr. Hutton, return the following items:—Creditors unsecured, £6,906; ditto holding security, £3,824; liabilities upon bills discounted, £6,968; and liabilities on shares in public companies, £94,500; making an aggregate liability of £112,199; against—good debts, £100; property surrendered to assignees, £734; and property in the hands of creditors, £3,500. Of the liabilities £72,000 are in regard to *Barned's Banking Company*, and £4,500 on account of the *Contract Corporation Company*. This was a sitting for examination and discharge.

Upon the application of Mr. *Lawrance*, an adjournment was ordered for cash and deficiency accounts.

## GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE.

### BREACHES OF TRUST.

Sir,—By your *Solicitors' Journal and Reporter*, Oct. 20, 1866, p. 1173, a gentleman asks a question respecting trustees (his initials are H. A. C.) and breaches of trust—when answer is given to the question I shall be obliged by having the paper. I am in a situation like H. A. C., from trustees under a will, and wish the answer. The trustees under the will I have never have advertised—the trustee clauses indemnify—and the one does not consider himself responsible for the other.

Would not a clause in a will saying so be null and void as a fraud? A. V. C.  
[“One has done sad work—other will not be responsible.”]

### SOLICITORS' CHARGES.

Sir,—At a time like the present, when a panic is raging in the middle classes owing to the badness of trade and scarcity of money, it becomes a sacred duty of persons suing to employ respectable solicitors who will not take advantage

of the circumstances of defendants and make them pay costs considerably in excess of what they are legally entitled to charge.

Allow me to illustrate by a case of my own. Having given an acceptance to a wholesale house, which became due this month, and was dishonoured through a mistake, a writ was issued on the day the money was offered to be paid, endorsed with £2 10s. costs, provided the amount was paid in twelve days. Now this is a much larger sum than can be claimed on taxation. On the twelfth day the money was offered, but there being a mistake in the amount, the solicitor said if it was paid before eleven the next night it would be all the same. Accordingly, before eleven on the thirteenth day, the principal and interest was tendered, when the solicitor claimed £3 for costs (the debt being £36 0s. 6d.), admitting at the same time they had gone no further than the issuing of the writ. This amount was objected to, but ultimately agreed to be paid if the solicitor would give a bill of his costs so that it might be taxed. This he positively refused to do, and has since signed judgment and threatens issuing execution, no doubt believing himself safe on the ground that the defendant could have employed a solicitor to take out a summons to stay on payment of debt and taxed costs, which would have increased the costs 100 per cent.

I contend, sir, a solicitor ought to charge only such prices as he could recover on taxation, and be compelled to give a bill in every case where it is demanded. Considering the total expense of issuing a writ is only 5s., they ought to be satisfied with the legal charge of £1 18s., without putting defendants to the expense of employing a solicitor.

Apologising for the length of this letter, I beg to subscribe myself, your obedient servant,

A TRADESMAN OF TWENTY-FIVE  
YEARS' STANDING.

### THE LAW OFFICERS.

Sir,—I think you will find that Sir Samuel Romilly and Sir Arthur Pigott, both practising at the chancery bar, held as colleagues the offices of Attorney and Solicitor-General about 1806.

WILLIAM DAWSON.

### JOINT-STOCK BANKS.

Sir,—As a means of future protection for the shareholders in these useful institutions, I would suggest that in all future joint-stock banks which may be established, or which may be resuscitated, there should be a special committee of the shareholders appointed for the purpose of inspecting the books of the establishment every three or six months, to ascertain and report to the general shareholders every transaction by which the directors and managers shall have accommodated any person or firm above a certain amount, (say £1,000) and the security taken therefor, and every transaction which shall not be legitimately within the province of a banker. For it is such transactions that bring destruction on joint-stock banks—whereas there is sufficient *bond fide* banking business to be done without endangering the funds of the banks in improper loans or speculations outside that of bankers, besides which it would put a stop to directors, promoters, and managers being accommodated or accommodating their personal friends in a manner and to an extent which they would not do if the funds under their control were their own. Joint-stock banks were never intended for private purposes, but for public use, and for the promotion of well considered and moderate accommodation to their customers upon proper and *bond fide* securities to a limited amount. What right have these establishments to be advancing to one party or firm thousands upon thousands to the ruin of the shareholders, or engaging in speculations outside the legitimate business of a banker? These observations equally apply to “financial establishments,” which are generally formed and promoted by persons who want to raise funds on securities not immediately available, at a profit of from £30 to £50 per cent. Is this a proper mode of doing business for any public body whatever? X. X.

### LAW LIBRARY IN THE CITY.

Sir,—I beg to call your attention to the great inconvenience that is caused by the absence of a law library in the city; its want has long been felt, and I am surprised no move has been made before in the matter.

I feel sure there would be but little difficulty in raising the requisite funds, as I have mentioned the subject to

several city solicitors, who all expressed their willingness to contribute towards the foundation of one. It would be premature to discuss details as to position, &c., until I hear that the city solicitors are likely to co-operate in the movement. I should be very glad to hear the views of your correspondents upon the subject. A CITY SOLICITOR.

## COLONIAL TRIBUNALS & JURISPRUDENCE.

### CANADA.

#### THE LAW REPORTERS.

A similar agitation to that which was lately quieted in England by the arrangements resulting in the *Law Reports* now supplied to the profession has during the last few months affected us in Upper Canada. Numerous schemes have been suggested and discussed, but the one which has found favour in the eyes of the benchers, and which is to be carried out is the following:—The three reporters are to be paid a fixed salary by the society, and the society become, so to speak, their own publishers. A volume of reports containing Practice Court and Common Law Chamber decisions will also be published, and thus make the series complete. All the reports will be furnished to practitioners free, and the reports will doubtless be obtainable by those who are not practising attorneys or solicitors at a reasonable rate. To pay expenses, practitioners will be required to pay fifteen dols. for their annual certificates under the authority of the late Act. An allowance has been made by the society towards the remuneration of a reporter for Practice Court and Common Law Chambers, and Henry O'Brien, Esq., barrister-at-law, and one of the conductors of this journal, has been appointed to fill the office.—*Upper Canada Law Journal*.

## SOCIETIES AND INSTITUTIONS.

### ARTICLED CLERKS' SOCIETY.

#### REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE AT THE ANNUAL MEETING, 24TH OCTOBER 1866.

The frequent additions which are made to the roll of members, both honorary and ordinary, forms the best evidence of a continued recognition of those benefits for the attainment of which the society was instituted, and the most satisfactory assurance of the society's future prosperity; whilst the fact that there has been no change during the past session in the list of officers is a sufficient proof of the increasing interest taken in the society's work by those to whom the conduct of its operations has been entrusted.

On the 8th of November, 1865, the second inauguration meeting was held in the hall of King's College, London, under the presidency of Sir Fitzroy Kelly, Q.C., M.P.; and your committee desires to record its grateful sense of the kindness of that distinguished gentleman in delivering a speech full of sound practical advice to articulated clerks, and in drawing the attention of the profession and the public to the society as an important medium of legal education.

On the 6th of June, 1866, the second anniversary meeting was held under the presidency of Professor Cutler, B.A., of King's College, to whom, for his kind assistance on that and other occasions, your committee is much indebted.

The society has held during the past session 24 meetings. Of these, 20 have been appropriated to debate and 3 to general business; and 1 (an extraordinary general meeting) was called to consider the desirability of continuing the law classes instituted by the Incorporated Law Society.

The subjects discussed have included 5 of a legal, 8 of a jurisprudential, and 7 of a general character, as follows:—

Legal—1. Charitable bequests. 2. Liability of infant husbands. 3. Liability of victuallers. 4. Partnership premiums. 5. The case of *Fox v. The Bishop of Chester*.

Jurisprudential—1. Circumstantial evidence. 2. The marriage laws. 3. Compulsory purchase by railway companies. 4. Barristers' fees. 5. The law of inheritance. 6. Puffers at auctions. 7. Criminal appeal. 8. Abolition of copyholds.

General—1. Political non-intervention. 2. Representation of the colonies in Parliament. 3. Public discussion of great crimes. 4. Governor Eyre. 5. Marriage with a deceased wife's sister. 6. The *Times* newspaper. 7. Solicitors' remuneration.

The society's financial position, the details of which may be learned from the treasurer's yearly statement, is highly

satisfactory. Your committee has established a reserve fund, to which additions are made whenever rendered practicable by the state of the balance in hand, and it believes that the stability of the society will thereby be most materially increased.

The efforts of your committee to obtain a more suitable place for the society's meetings met with success soon after the commencement of the session. On the 14th of March last the members of the society assembled for the first time in Clement's-inn Hall, where the meetings have since been held, and your committee is deeply grateful to the Honourable Society of Clement's-inn for its kindness in granting the use of its hall, and thereby greatly promoting the cause of legal education.

The subject of a proposed permission to articulated clerks to appear as advocates before those tribunals where solicitors are now heard, having been referred to your committee, the opinions of the principal legal institutions were taken, the majority of which were in accordance with that expressed by yourselves. Although your committee is not at present prepared to adopt any particular mode of action, it will endeavour to ventilate the subject throughout the profession by whatever means may be in its power, in the conviction that, by such a course, the merits of the question will be most accurately understood, and any desirable reform most promptly carried out.

Your committee convened an extraordinary meeting to consider whether any alterations or improvements in the mode of conducting the law classes established by the Incorporated Law Society were either necessary or advisable. A paper treating on the subject very fully was read before the meeting by Mr. W. J. Fraser, and much valuable information was given both by members and visitors; and it was resolved that the law classes deserved the support of all articulated clerks, as being a most important step towards that which should be the ultimate object in the reform of legal education—viz., a law university.

Your committee has much pleasure in recording the union which has been effected of the Scots' Law Society with the Articled Clerks' Society.

It having been resolved, at a meeting of the society, that a rule providing for the election of representative members should be added to the society's rules, Mr. Edmund F. Davis was elected to represent the society in the Incorporated Law Society; and in pursuance of an application for making the society a corporate member of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, Messrs. Wynne E. Baxter and P. W. Drummond were elected to represent the society in that association.

The institution during the past session of the "Davis Prize" must be highly gratifying to all who desire to increase the utility of the society; and your committee desires to express its gratitude to the donor for his liberality and its sense of the interest he has thereby taken in the society's welfare. The subject chosen for the Davis Prize Essay, 1866, was capital punishment, and the select committee has awarded the prize to the essay written by Mr. Patrick William Drummond.

At the final examination in Trinity Term last the Clifford's-inn Prize was gained by Mr. John Richards Collins, one of the Society's ordinary members.

Arrangements have been made for a course of gratuitous lectures to be delivered monthly during the next session by barristers and solicitors, particulars of which will be found in the society's advertisements. Your committee trusts that members will show, by a numerous and regular attendance, their appreciation of the kindness of those gentlemen who have consented to lecture.

The programme for the session affords the best evidence of the society's continued and increasing prosperity. That that programme may prove attractive your committee confidently hopes, and in all its official undertakings for the future it relies upon that co-operation and support which has been so liberally accorded to it in the past.

## OBITUARY.

### HENRY LAST, Esq.

This gentleman died on the 14th ultimo at his residence, Layham-cottage, Hadleigh, Suffolk, in the forty-fourth year of his age. He was certificated in Michaelmas Term, 1845; was a member of the firm of Robinson, Safford, & Last, of Hadleigh; and clerk to the magistrates of Cosford.



**LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL.**

**LAW LECTURES AT THE INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.**

Mr. E. CHARLES, on Equity, Monday, Nov. 5.  
Mr. H. W. LORD, on Common Law and Mercantile Law, Friday, Nov. 9.

**LAW CLASSES AT THE INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.**

Mr. D. STURGES, on Equity, Monday, Nov. 5, class A, elementary and advanced. Thursday, Nov. 8, class B, elementary and advanced.

Mr. A. BAILEY, on Real Property, Tuesday, Nov. 6, class B, elementary and advanced. Friday, Nov. 9, class A, elementary and advanced.

Mr. E. A. C. SCHALCH, on Common Law, Wednesday, Nov. 7, class B, elementary and advanced.

**COURT PAPERS.**

**CHANCERY CAUSE LIST.**

**BEFORE THE LORD CHANCELLOR AND LORDS JUSTICES.**

*Appeals.*

(L. C.) Att.-Gen. v. Master, Fellows, and Scholars of Sydney Sussex College, Cambridge pthd (R.—Jan 17)  
(L. C.) Same v. Same pthd (R.—Jan. 17)  
(L. C.) Harries v. Rees (S.—Jan. 18)  
Eaton v. France (S.—Feb. 8)  
Morris v. Lilanely Ry. and Dock Co. (S.—Feb. 13)  
Baxter v. Oliver (R.—Feb. 26)  
(L. C.) Thomas v. Daw (K.—Feb. 26)  
Ferguson v. Wilson (S.—March 1)  
Homfray v. Fothergill (S.—March 2)  
(L. C.) Drennan v. Andrew (K.—March 3)  
Roberts v. Roberts (S.—March 7)  
Duddell v. Simpson (S.—March 15)  
(L. C.) Knox v. Gye (W.—March 16)  
(L. C.) Co. of Proprietors of the Sheffield Waterworks v. Yeomans (K.—March 21)  
(L. C.) Butt v. Imperial Gas Light & Coke Co. (K.—March 24)  
Minton v. Kirwood (S.—March 26)  
Western v. McDermot (R.—March 28)  
Buckland v. Papillon (R.—April 5)  
Thompson v. Marquis of Normandy (S.—April 6)  
Waters v. Earl of Shaftesbury (S.—April 13)  
Procter v. Robinson (R.—April 14)  
(L. C.) Tate v. Williamson W.—April 14)  
(L. C.) Binney v. Ince Hall Coal and Cannel Co. (K.—April 14)  
Kay v. Hargreaves (S.—A. 17)  
Harvey v. Clarke (R.—Ap. 17)  
Kendall v. Watson; Watson v. Kendall (S.—April 19)  
Gordon v. Gordon (S.—Ap. 19)  
Fryer v. Davies (R.—April 23)  
Walmsley v. Pilkington (R.—May 1)  
Johnstone (S.—Hamilton v., May 2)

Raphael v. Thames Valley Ry. Co. (R.—May 5)  
Pettinger v. Ambler; Bunn v. Pettinger (R.—May 7)  
Forsbrook v. Forsbrook (S.—May 8)  
Earl Howe v. Earl of Lichfield (R.—May 8)  
(L. C.) Coope v. Cresswell (K.—May 8)  
Cook v. Glass (S.—May 9)  
Bovill v. Goodier (R.—May 24)  
(L. C.) Lewer v. Earl of Shaftesbury (W.—May 28)  
(L. C.) Cubitt v. Cooper (W.—June 6)  
Patch v. Ward (S.—June 8)  
Martin v. Headon (K.—June 9)  
Thorpe v. Mattinson (S.—June 12)  
Calcraft v. Thompson (R.—June 21)  
Belaney v. Belaney (R.—June 22)  
Massey v. Massey (W.—Ju 29)  
Hancock v. Reeves (R.—June 30)  
Ennor v. Eng. & For. Credit Co., limited (R.—July 4)  
Ennor v. Eng. & For. Credit Co., limited (R.—July 4)  
Phillips v. Hudson (R.—July 10)  
Fielden, Bt., v. Mayor, &c., of Blackburn (W.—July 14)  
Att.-Gen. v. Staff. Copper Extract Co., limited (W.—July 16).  
Simmons v. Brit. Nat. Life Ass. Ass. (S.—July 23)  
Grady v. Taylor (R.—July 23)  
Thornton v. Howe (R.—July 24)  
Tilley v. Thomas (S.—July 24)  
Att.-Gen. v. Mid-Kent Ry Co. (S.—July 25)  
Pilgrim v. Auction Mart Co., limited (W.—July 26)  
Eyre v. Stilt [V. C. of County Palatine of Lanc.] (July 27)  
Osborn v. Duke of Marlborough (S.—July 28)  
Hynam v. Dunn (W.—Aug. 4)  
Austin v. Tawney (R.—Au. 9)  
Thruston v. Gausson (R.—Aug 9)  
Snowball v. Wrightson (W.—Oct. 5)

*Causes, &c.*

(L. C.) Baxendale v. West Midland Ry. Co. m d

(L. C.) Baxendale v. Gt. Wn. Ry. Co. m d  
(L. C.) Baily v. Keighley f c

**BEFORE THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS.**

*Causes, &c.*

Stevens v. Harvey m d pt hd  
Cox v. Horsley (2) d  
Ricketts v. Long m d  
Cross v. Raven f c  
Cooper v. Jarman f c & sum  
England v. Lavers f c  
Branker v. Carne m d  
Carne v. Branker m d  
Ormerod v. Rostron f c  
Verelst v. Midland Railway Co. m d  
Wood v. Joynson m d  
Kernochan v. Ryland m d  
Jarvis v. Allen m d  
Chadwick v. Young m d  
Turquand v. Miller m d  
Minikin v. Mackinlay m d  
Penaluna v. Edwards m d  
Libri v. Sotheby m d  
Grissell v. Money c wits  
Byre v. Ross m d  
Jones v. Badley c wits  
Kidd v. Tomlinson m d  
Tomlinson v. Gregg m d  
Champaign v. Coghlan f c  
Shaw v. Beazley c wits  
Lefevre v. Huskisson m d  
Simons v. Bagnall m d  
Hodgson v. Hodgson c  
Wilding v. Lander m d  
Cooper v. Lawes m d  
Upehurch v. Ekins m d  
Parker v. Butcher m d  
Lefroy v. Scott, Bart m d  
King v. E. and W. Junction Railway Co. m d  
Walshe v. Donmetts c wit  
Barnard v. Sayers c wit  
Hamilton v. Spottiswoode c  
Coffin v. Searby c  
Ferguson v. Watts m d  
Visconti v. Bowen m d  
Davis v. Davis m d  
Dummetts v. Symes m d  
Neame v. Moorsom m d  
Webster, Bart. v. Cook c  
Kirk v. Faulkner m d  
Oldham v. Oldham m d  
Gellatly v. Smith m d  
Philby v. Philby c  
In re Crewe; Sewell v. Crewe—Read f c  
Howse v. Lawrie m d  
Dell v. Cocke m d  
Allen v. Jarvis m d  
In re Hodge's Estate; Hodge v. Cross f c & sum  
Righton v. Righton f c  
Lawrance v. Bell f c  
Peterson v. Peterson f c & pt  
Jackson v. Henderson f c  
Buswell v. Linnell m d  
Barillon v. Carr f c  
Blogg v. Johnson f c

Carlton v. Truscott f c  
Phillipson v. Mayor f c  
Crawley v. Carter m d  
Croskill v. Faithwaite c  
Markwick v. Over f c  
Hodges v. Grant; Hodges v. Deck f c  
Steuart v. Hay; Mackintosh v. Steuart f c & sum  
Franklin v. Hall f c  
Winter v. Wallis f c  
Robinson v. Boycott m d  
Clarke v. Sunderland m d  
Heane v. Evans m d  
In re Hayslem; Royer v. Marshall f c  
In re Robinson's Estate; Compton v. Portal f c  
Canadian Loan and Investment Co., (limited) v. Kemp m d  
Harris v. Nunn f c & sum  
Dickinson v. London Chatham & Dover Ry. Co. m d  
Overman v. Overman f c  
Leigh v. Birch f c & sum  
Gosling v. Gosling f c  
Fryer v. Ward f c & sum  
Kerby v. Hampson m d  
Morris v. Kenrick m d  
Evans v. Jones f c  
West v. Rowberry m d  
Hodgson v. Churchman m d  
Morison v. Great Eastern Ry. Co. m d  
Goodfellow v. Thirlwall m d  
Read v. Read m d  
London & South-Western Bank (Lim.) v. Maples m d  
Hodder v. Gilbert m d  
Wilkinson v. Wilkinson f c  
Lea v. Grime f c  
Robins v. Edwards m d  
Daveron v. Barlow f c  
Haines v. Haines m d  
Edmonds v. Millett f c  
Clutton v. Clutton m d  
Warde v. Kane f c & sum  
Boltho v. Hillyar f c  
Whyte v. Preston f c  
Hutchinson v. Dickson, m d  
Tottenham v. Maitland m d  
Turner v. Jones m d  
Dell v. Griffiths c  
Jackson v. Hodges m d  
Snowley v. Gt. Eastern Rail. Co. m d  
Howard v. Hunt m d  
Halford v. Brooks m d  
Morten v. Gt. Eastern Rail. Co. m d  
Eastlake v. Eastlake f c  
Henry v. Macdonald m d  
Poppleton v. Walker m d  
Wilby v. Gartside m d

**BEFORE VICE-CHANCELLOR SIR RICHARD T. KINDERSLEY.**

*Causes, &c.*

Langton v. Waite ex to an Earl of Eglington v. Lamb, Bt. m d  
Earl of Eglington v. Lamb, Bt. m d  
Ransome v. Burgess m d  
Johnson v. Hodgson c wit  
Wakefield v. Duke of Buccleugh m d wit  
Dickson v. Wason m d

Morrill v. Withey m d  
Taylor v. Pearsall m d  
Sullivan v. Ward m d  
Lloyd v. Ashford m d  
Ashman v. Sperring m d wit  
Binney v. Chattaway m d  
Rothery v. Nelson c  
Trickett v. Russell m d  
Upton v. Mavor m d  
Mackenna v. Parkes c  
Johnston v. Brunskill c

Fox v. Dellestable m d  
 Thomas v. Cresswell m d  
 Ormandy v. Okell m d  
 Pigou v. Estate Co. (lim) m d  
 Loveridge v. Bates m d  
 Yeatman v. Read m d  
 Hilton v. Hilton m d  
 Dolwin v. Ellis m d  
 Villars v. Tink m d  
 Crawford v. Higgs m d  
 White v. Birch m d  
 Hancock v. Bateman m d  
 Baring v. Harris c  
 Wason v. Metro. District. Ry. Co. m d  
 Corrock v. Grant m d  
 Fox v. Jones m d  
 Collyer v. Collyer sp c  
 Pearce v. Smalpage m d  
 Curling v. Walters m d  
 Slattery v. Axton c on app from Brompton County Ct.  
 The Governor, &c., of Poor of Bristol v. Pearce sp c  
 Harrison v. Lewis c  
 Smith v. James m d  
 Simon v. Edwards m d

## BEFORE VICE-CHANCELLOR SIR JOHN STUART.

*Causes, &c.*

Evans v. Williams m d  
 Peter v. Jones m d  
 Steedman v. Silvester f c  
 Gedy v. Symons c wit.  
 Pole, Bart, v. Knox m d  
 Hope v. Beresford Hope f c  
 Affleck, Bart, v. Fortescue m d  
 Hoare v. Mq of Aylesbury m d  
 Childers v. Eardley m d  
 Platt v. Walter c  
 Lee v. Angus c wit  
 Dudeney v. Hall m d  
 Betts v. Rimmel m d (Nov. 15)  
 Denny v. Denny m d  
 Ilderton v. Marshall c  
 Keighley v. Barnes m d  
 Hallett v. Farley m d  
 Hunt v. Williams c  
 Smith v. Barnes m d  
 Wilson v. Grey c  
 Devereux v. Devereux m d  
 Browne v. Hunter c  
 Vets. Gort v. Clark c  
 White v. Parker c  
 Att-Gen. v. Bp. of Manch. c  
 Wyatt v. Steel c  
 Feaver v. Williams c  
 Dodd v. Holbrook exs to rep  
 Paine v. Hutchinson m d  
 Bacon v. Coles m d  
 Beckwith v. Booth m d  
 Hope v. Carnegie m d  
 Singleton v. Pitman m d  
 Blomfield v. L. C. & D. Ry. Co. m d  
 Brocklesby v. Lyford m d  
 Aders v. Hogg m d  
 Absolon v. Gibbon m d  
 Stanforth v. White c  
 Bailey v. Bailey m d  
 Atwood v. Maude m d  
 Parsons v. Webb m d  
 Heriot v. L. C. & D. Ry. Co. m d  
 Wimssett v. Simpson m d (wit.)  
 Jones v. Wilbraham m d  
 Reed v. Wilkins c  
 Hallett v. Garrett m d  
 Phillips v. Pullen m d  
 Beck v. Davis m d  
 Barlow v. Perkins m d  
 Rudd v. Aislibie c  
 Craven v. Traill m d  
 Moore v. Webster sp c

International Bank (limited) v. Gladstone m d  
 Fiddee v. Stanway c  
 Grieve v. Grievie sp c  
 Brayne v. Reeves m d  
 Reeves v. Gladding m d  
 Pudsey Union Waterloo Mill Co. v. Merritt m d  
 Lewin v. Lewin m d  
 Begbie v. Fenwick c  
 In re Clements; Clarke v. Clemmans f c  
 Scotto v. Heritage c  
 Att-Gen. v. Earl Lonsdale c  
 Saunderson v. Fowler sp c  
 Beecher v. Major f c  
 Millard v. Ellyett f c  
 Att-Gen. v. Lawson m d  
 Mayor, &c., of Hythe v. East c  
 Wynnatt v. Vaughan c  
 Powell v. Scott sp c  
 Waterlow v. Bacon m d  
 Parish v. Wilkinson m d  
 Speight v. Foster m d  
 Shoolbred v. Metrop. Rail. Co. m d  
 Barker v. Barker f c

Lucas v. Boulton m d  
 Whiting v. George m d  
 Mallock v. Still f c  
 Donaldson v. Gillet c  
 Walter v. Platt m d  
 Yules v. Yules m d  
 Phillips v. Andrew m d  
 King v. Brown f c & sums  
 Whittington v. Green m d  
 Niblett v. Bristol & S. Wales Union Ry. Co. m d  
 Davies v. Danderwen Slate Co. (Limited) m d  
 Loughborough v. Duncan f c & mot  
 Blackford v. Davis m d  
 Henry v. Smyth m d  
 Evison v. Cottingham m d  
 In re Stubbs; Stubbs v. Marsh f c, ch  
 Wilson v. Charlton f c  
 Ilderton v. Dutton m d  
 Atkinson v. Swann m d  
 Rowley v. Broade c  
 Humphreys v. Humphreys f c  
 Phillips v. Crouch m d  
 Davies v. Jones cause set down by defendants  
 Owen v. Swancott c  
 Beaumont v. Fryer f c  
 Battison v. Hobson m d  
 Fell v. Fell m d  
 L. & N. W. Ry. Co. v. Earl of Dartmouth m d (short)  
 Turner v. Turner f c  
 Foulsham v. Foulsham m d  
 Foster v. Jones f c  
 Grave v. Turner c  
 Burbey v. Burbey f c  
 Ledsam v. Nutt m d  
 Rose v. Rowe m d  
 Hall v. Waterhouse f c  
 Bell v. Foster m d  
 Bromilow v. Haddock m d  
 Craven v. Craven m d  
 Norbury v. Johnson m d  
 Yetts v. Marsh m d  
 Gardner v. L. C. & D. Ry. Co. m d  
 Drawbridge v. Same m d  
 Campbell v. Bainbridge m d  
 Ottley v. Ottley m d  
 The Brit. Pru. & Cons. Ass. Co. v. Bradburn m d  
 Turton v. Barber m d

The Brit. Pru. & Cons. Ass. Co. v. Chadwick m d  
 Short v. Roberts m d

Robertson v. Scott f c  
 Danell v. Hayling Ry. Co. m d

## BEFORE VICE-CHANCELLOR SIR WILLIAM PAGE WOOD.

*Causes, &c.*

Horwood v. Bagnall m d  
 Davenport v. Townsend c  
 Jackson v. Shanks c  
 De la Peyrouse v. Pelly ex an  
 Jackson v. Bognor Ry. Co. m d  
 Jackson v. Bognor Ry. Co. m d  
 Thorn v. Croft sp c  
 Roger v. Allison m d  
 Williams v. Bagnall c  
 Brittlebank v. Goodwin ex an  
 Rayment v. Boorn m d  
 Joint Stock Discount Co. limited v. Brown dem  
 Stewart v. Austin (2) dem  
 Foster v. Gladstone m d  
 Wedderburne v. Thomas c p c  
 Greenhalgh v. Rumney c  
 Hinde v. Morton c  
 Farrer v. Mould f c  
 Wedderburne v. Thomas c  
 Wickham v. Scaife c  
 Bovill v. Crate m d  
 Saunders v. Mackeson c wit  
 Betts v. Neilson m d  
 Hallows v. Fernie m d  
 Nicholl v. Jones c wit  
 Greenhalgh v. Rumney c wit  
 Morgan v. Fuller trial without a jury  
 Dennison v. Curtis c  
 Morgan v. Fuller viv voc  
 Atwool v. Merryweather c wit  
 Pietroni v. Transatlantic Co. c  
 Bell v. Nevin sp c  
 Slee v. International Bank (limited) m d  
 Baines v. Ibbetson sp c  
 Chamberlaine v. Orred c  
 Brooks v. Ponting m d  
 Fleming v. Fleming sp c  
 Whittaker v. Fox m d  
 Hunt v. Sidney m d  
 Borman v. Willmet c  
 Pearson v. Dolman c  
 Pearson v. Dolman c  
 Senior v. Pawson m d  
 Morgan v. McAdam c  
 Hamilton v. Buckmaster m d  
 Sparling v. Brereton m d  
 Lamb v. Samuelson c  
 Robinson v. Lyttleton m d  
 Hill v. Rawlinson m d  
 Tweed v. Wagstaff c  
 Orred v. Chamberlaine c  
 Pickett v. Longley m d  
 Hicks v. Slade m d  
 Cox v. Gifford c  
 De Winton v. Evans m d  
 Brackenbury v. Gibbons c  
 De la Peyrouse v. Pelly m d  
 Lord v. Lord m d  
 Hooper v. Elliot c  
 Stevens v. Crouch c  
 Armstrong v. Wainwright m d  
 Hurry v. Morgan sp c  
 Wolverhampton & Staffordshire Banking Co. v. Hopkins m d  
 Blake v. Blake c  
 Att-Gen. v. West Riding & Grimsby Ry. Co. m d  
 Wilson, Bart. v. Metropolitan & St. John's-wood Ry. Co. m d  
 Colquhoun v. Onvry m d  
 Clarke v. Bathe m d  
 Lord Norbury v. Kitchin fur. hearing after issue at law

Edmondson v. Jeffries m d  
 Ross v. Estates Investment Co. (limited) m d  
 Newall v. Telegraph Construction & Maintenance Co. (limited) c wit  
 Maxwell v. Wightwick m d  
 Kingston v. Palmer m d  
 Stribling v. Lewis c  
 Jackson v. Ivimey c  
 Elgar v. Wilson m d  
 Maxwell v. Mievill m d  
 Lumb v. Heald m d  
 Irvine v. Sullivan m d  
 Western v. Western c  
 Firth v. Fowler m d  
 Firth v. Fowler m d  
 Stepany v. Chambers c  
 Newall v. Telegraph Construction & Maintenance Co. (limited) trial without jury  
 Wright v. Symonds m d  
 Alger v. Parrott sp c  
 Skey v. Skey f c  
 Peek v. Matthews m d  
 Hawkins v. Hine m d  
 Williams v. Gratex c  
 Gonne v. Cook sp c  
 Eastwood v. Lockwood m d  
 Smedley v. Smedley c  
 Jackson v. Cartwright m d  
 Thomas v. Appleby c  
 Bank of India v. Bell c  
 Richardson v. Richardson m d  
 Neate v. Vosper c  
 Todd v. Hutton m d  
 Robertson v. Morley c  
 Barff v. Gourley m d  
 Cary v. Knowles m d  
 Macnee v. Rawdon m d  
 Macnee v. Gorst m d  
 Dean v. Gibson f c  
 Gill v. Bagshaw f c  
 Normandy's Patent Marine Aerated Fresh Water Co. (lim.) v. Greenfield c  
 De Colquhoun v. Ferris m d  
 Pickett v. Packham m d  
 Chester v. Chester f c  
 Cherret v. Keipe f c  
 Jackson v. Tyas m d  
 Smith v. Rayden c  
 Symington v. Whitehead f c  
 Ascombe v. Hallett m d  
 Emmerson v. Hall m d  
 Phelps v. Dyke sp c  
 Maule v. Eaton m d  
 Smith v. Copp f c  
 Acomb v. Landed Estates Co. (Limited) m d  
 Williamson v. Bates m d  
 Ridgway v. Ridgway m d  
 Bank of Hindustan, China, & Japan (Lim.) v. Smith m d  
 Surr v. Wainsley c  
 Maynard v. Kerrison, Bart c  
 Weymouth v. Wingfield m d  
 Treherne v. Butterfield c  
 Clarke v. Rawlins c  
 Madox v. Wyatt c  
 Miller v. Drysdale f c  
 Tayler v. Cox f c  
 Miller v. Dyball m d  
 Lucas v. Jones f c & sum  
 Beardmore v. Gregory m d  
 Mathews v. Mathews f c  
 Doughty v. Whiting m d  
 Murray v. Cockerell m d

Countess of Harrington v. E. of Harrington c  
Eatwell v. G. E. R. Co. m d  
Stammers v. Elliott m d  
Mc'Cardie v. Dickson trial by jury (6 Nov.)  
Marina v. Cathery c  
Allhuson v. Borries m d  
Swindell v. Marquis of Sligo f c

Strahan v. Graham c  
Munro v. The Tending Hundred Ry. Co. m d  
Wright v. Wilde m d  
Charlton v. Pugh m d  
Leicester v. Wood m d  
Dixon v. Fraser m d  
Att. Gen. v. Colney Hatch Asylum m d  
Maleham v. Chesters m d

# COURT OF CHANCERY.

## ORDER OF COURT.

Saturday, the 6th day of October, 1866.

The Right Honourable FREDERICK BARON CHELMSFORD, Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain, by and with the advice and assistance of the Right Honourable JOHN LORD ROMILLY, Master of the Rolls, and the Honourable the Vice-Chancellor SIR RICHARD TORIN KINDERSLEY, doth hereby, in pursuance of the statute 15 & 16 Vict. c. 86, and in pursuance and execution of all other powers enabling him in that behalf, order and direct in manner following:

1. Article 1 of rule 10 of order 33 of the Consolidated General Orders, and rules 12 and 13 of the same order, shall be respectively varied, and as varied shall be respectively read as follows:

Article 1 of rule 10 of order 33, and rule 12 of the same order, shall be respectively read as if the words "or set down a motion for a decree or decretal order," were expunged therefrom respectively, and in lieu of those words the words "or serve a notice of motion for a decree or decretal order," were inserted therein respectively:

And rule 13 of the same order shall be read as if the words "unless a motion for a decree or decretal order shall have been set down in the meantime" were expunged therefrom, and in lieu of those words the words "unless a notice of motion for a decree or decretal order shall have been served in the meantime," were inserted therein.

2. The plaintiff, who has served a notice of motion for a decree or decretal order, shall set down such motion within one week after the expiration of the time allowed to him by rule 7 of order 33, to file his affidavits in reply, in case the defendant shall have filed any affidavit—or within one week after the expiration of the time allowed to the defendant by rule 6 of order 33 to file his affidavits in answer, in case the defendant shall not have filed any affidavit. But in case the time allowed for either of the purposes aforesaid shall be enlarged, then within one week after the expiration of such enlarged time.

3. If the plaintiff shall fail to set down the motion within the time above limited the defendant may either move to dismiss the bill with costs, for want of prosecution, or set the motion down at his own request.

4. The Clerk of Records and Writs shall not give a certificate that a motion for a decree or decretal order is in a fit state to be set down until after the expiration of the time allowed to the plaintiff, by rule 7 of order 33, to file his affidavits in reply, in case the defendant shall have filed any affidavit, or until after the expiration of the time allowed to the defendant by rule 6 of order 33 to file his affidavits in answer, in case the defendant shall not have filed any affidavit. But in case the time allowed for either of the purposes aforesaid shall be enlarged, then not until after the expiration of such enlarged time.

5. In all cases in which the time allowed by rules 6 and 7 of order 33 for filing affidavits in answer or in reply shall be enlarged, notice thereof shall be given to the Clerk of Records and Writs by production of the order for such enlargement.

CHELMSFORD, C.  
ROMILLY, M. R.  
RICHARD T. KINDERSLEY, V. C.

## WINDING-UP CASES.

All *ex parte* applications, whether for cheques, direction, or otherwise, must be put into the Chief Clerk's list.

The Junior Clerk will, on request made before twelve o'clock on any day, put any such case, if urgent, in the list for the next day.

All necessary papers must be left with the Junior Clerk at the time the case is put in the list.

No cheques will be delivered out except to the official liquidator himself, or to some person authorized by him in writing.

## COURT OF PROBATE

### COURT FOR DIVORCE AND MATRIMONIAL CAUSES.

Sittings in and after Michaelmas Term, 1866.

## COURT OF PROBATE.

Saturday ..... Nov. 3 | Thursday ..... Nov. 8  
Wednesday ..... " 7 | Saturday ..... " 10

### FULL COURT FOR DIVORCE AND MATRIMONIAL CAUSES.

Friday ..... Nov. 9.

### COURT FOR DIVORCE AND MATRIMONIAL CAUSES.

Wednesday ..... Nov. 14 | Wednesday ..... Nov. 21  
Thursday ..... " 15 | Thursday ..... " 22  
Friday ..... " 16 | Friday ..... " 23  
Saturday ..... " 17 | Saturday ..... " 24

## Trials by Jury.

Wednesday ..... Nov. 28 | Wednesday ..... Dec. 12  
Thursday ..... " 29 | Thursday ..... " 13  
Friday ..... " 30 | Friday ..... " 14  
Saturday ..... Dec. 1 | Saturday ..... " 15  
Wednesday ..... " 5 | Wednesday ..... " 19  
Thursday ..... " 6 | Thursday ..... " 20  
Friday ..... " 7 | Friday ..... " 21  
Saturday ..... " 8 | Saturday ..... " 22

The trials by jury in the Court of Probate will be taken first, unless otherwise directed by the judge.

The judge will sit in chambers to hear summonses at 11 o'clock, and in court to hear motions at 12 o'clock on Tuesday, Nov. 6th, and on every succeeding Tuesday until Tuesday, Dec. 18th, inclusive.

All papers for motions in the Court of Probate are to be left with the clerk of the papers in the principal registry of that court at Doctors' Commons, and for motions in the Court for Divorce and Matrimonial Causes, with the chief clerk in the registry of that court at Doctors' Commons, before two o'clock on the preceding Thursday.

## PUBLIC COMPANIES.

### ENGLISH FUNDS AND RAILWAY STOCK.

LAST QUOTATION, Nov. 1, 1866.

[From the Official List of the actual business transacted.]

## GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

3 per Cent. Consols, 89½  
Ditto for Account, Nov. 8 89½  
3 per Cent. Reduced, 87  
5 per Cent. Consols, 87  
Do. 3½ per Cent., Jan. '94  
Do. 2½ per Cent., Jan. '94  
Do. 5 per Cent., Jan. '73—  
Annuities, Jan. '80—  
Annuities, April, '85  
Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1908—  
Ex Bills, £1000, 3 per Ct. pm  
Ditto, £200, Do. pm  
Ditto, £100 & £200, Do 4 pm  
Bank of England Stock, 6½ per Ct. (last half-year)  
Ditto for Account,—

## INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

India Stock, 10½ p Ct. Apr. '74  
Ditto for Account,—  
Ditto 5 per Cent., July, '70 106½  
Ditto for Account,—  
Ditto 4 per Cent., Oct. '83  
Ditto, ditto, Certificates,—  
Ditto Enforced 1½ p., 4 per Cent.  
Ind. Enf. Pr., 5 p Ct., Jan. '79 101½  
Ditto, 5½ per Cent., May, '79  
Ditto Debentures, per Cent., April, '84—  
Do. Do., 5 per Cent., Aug. '73 102½  
Do. Bonds, 4 per Ct., £1000, 22 pm  
Ditto, ditto, under £1000, 21 pm

## INSURANCE COMPANIES.

No. of shares	Dividend per annum	Names.	Shares.	Paid.	Price per share.
5000	5 per cent	Clerical, Med. & Gen. Life	100	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
4000	40 pc & bs	County ...	100	10 0	26 17 6
40000	8 per cent	Eagle ...	50	5 0	0 85 0 0
10000	7½ is 8d pc	Equity and Law ...	100	6 0	0 6 17 6
30000	7½ is 10d pc	English & Scot. Law Life	50	5 0	0 7 15 0
2700	5 per cent	Equitable Reversionary...	105	5 0	0 4 15 0
4600	5 per cent	Do. New ...	50	50 0	0 45 0 0
5000	5 & 3 psh b	Gresham Life ...	20	5 0	0
20000	5 per cent	Guardian ...	100	50 0	0 44 0 0
20000	7 per cent	Home & Col. Ass., Limtd.	50	5 0	0 2 0 0
7500	8½ per cent	Imperial Life ...	100	10 0	0 15 0 0
50000	10 per cent	Law Fire ...	100	2 10	0 5 0 0
10000	32½ pr ct	Law Life ...	100	10 0	0 87 15 0
100000	6 6 7 pr ct	Law Union ...	10	0 10	0 0 16 6
20000	6s p share	Legal & General Life	50	8 0	0 8 0 0
20000	5 per cent	London & Provincial Law	50	4 17	8 4 5 0
40000	10 per cent	North Brit. & Mercantile	50	6 5	0 16 15 0
2500	12½ & bns	Provident Life ...	100	10 0	0 38 0 0
689220	20 per cent	Royal Exchange...	Stock	All	255.
—	6½ per cent	Sun Fire ...	...	All	203 0 0
4000	...	Do. Life ...	...	All	63 0 0



## RAILWAY STOCK.

Shares.	Railways.	Paid.	Closing Prices
Stock	Bristol and Exeter .....	100	88
Stock	Caledonian .....	100	122½
Stock	Glasgow and South-Western .....	100	119
Stock	Great Eastern Ordinary Stock .....	100	26½
Stock	Do., East Anglian Stock, No. 2 .....	100	6
Stock	Great Northern .....	100	117
Stock	Do., A Stock* .....	100	128
Stock	Great Southern and Western of Ireland .....	100	92
Stock	Great Western—Original .....	100	52½
Stock	Do., West Midland—Oxford .....	100	38
Stock	Do., do., Newport .....	100	35
Stock	Lancashire and Yorkshire .....	100	125
Stock	London, Brighton, and South Coast .....	100	90
Stock	London, Chatham, and Dover .....	100	19½
Stock	London and North-Western .....	100	118½
Stock	London and South-Western .....	100	84
Stock	Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln .....	100	52½
Stock	Metropolitan .....	100	122½
10	Do., New .....	—	2pm
Stock	Midland .....	100	125
Stock	Do., Birmingham and Derby .....	100	96
Stock	North British .....	100	37
Stock	North London .....	100	122
10	Do., 1864 .....	5	7
Stock	North Staffordshire .....	100	74
Stock	Scottish Central .....	100	154
Stock	South Devon .....	100	45
Stock	South-Eastern .....	100	66
Stock	Taff Vale .....	100	145
10	Do., C .....	—	3pm

\* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

## MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

Thursday Night.

To-day was observed as a holiday upon the Stock Exchange, to give an opportunity to the Bank of England to make up the half-yearly balance; and business has necessarily, therefore, been only nominal.

The Bank court separated without altering its official *minimum*. The bullion exhibits an increase of £346,232; there is an addition of £250,550 to the reserve of notes, but other securities have decreased half-a-million.

In Foreign Stocks no movement of importance has occurred, and prices, though firm generally, are scarcely altered.

The Railway Share market continues dull.

The debenture-holders' committee of the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway have issued a circular, in which they state that although the net receipts for the half-year are being paid into court, there will still be a considerable deficiency, and interest to Christmas will remain unprovided for; and they desire to be put in a position to protect debenture-holders in the event of an application to Parliament during the coming session.

Bank Shares are unaltered, but the final quotations are the following:—The London Joint-Stock, 42½; London and County, 61½ and 61½; London Chartered Bank of Australia, 22½; London and Westminster, 94; Colonial, 35½ and 36; Chartered Bank of China, 17½; Chartered Mercantile Bank, 34½; British North American, 46½ and 46½; and Union Bank of Australia, at 48.

At a meeting of proprietors of the Mercantile and Exchange Bank, held at Liverpool on Tuesday, it transpired that the affairs of the company were much more satisfactory than was anticipated, there being still £250,000 of capital in tact, and the question of forfeited shares is reserved for a future meeting.

A report issued by the liquidators of the Commercial Bank of India and the East, shows a surplus of £181,000 subject to certain costs, and a dividend will shortly be announced.

The conviction of the late manager of the Leeds Banking Company should have a salutary effect in checking the reckless conduct of others who may fill a similar capacity, and rendering those safeguards which the Legislature has provided more conducive to the laudable ends which Parliament had in view. The recent trial has given to the world a picture of directorial neglect of duty which it is to be hoped is without many parallels. The two directors who were paid for overlooking the manager seem to have played, no doubt innocently enough, the part of puppets, whilst the manager—or, rather, the mismanager—pulled the strings; and thus it happened that those who ought to have known most of the concerns of the bank, were helplessly ignorant of the irregularities which were being practised, consisting in advances of the most hopeless character, and resulting in "cooked accounts," and falsified balance-sheets, which the shareholders as a body had no means of checking. After the exposures which have been made in the case of the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Company, as to which one member of the Committee of Investigation has stated publicly that no true account has been published for the last five years, it is clear that the present system of audit is little better than a delusion. The Birmingham Banking Company merits all the praise which has been bestowed upon it for initiating a more perfect system of audit; but until the auditors have authority to attend Board meetings, and have thus an opportunity of learning the

initiation of transactions, as contrasted with a mere statement of results, no auditing of accounts can give security to shareholders; and the sooner auditors are permitted to be present at meetings of the Board, without the power of voting, the sooner will the investing public feel that they have a hold upon those whom they pay to perform a very important duty.

Petitions have been presented to wind up the following companies:—The Inns of Court Hotel Company (Limited); The Financial Insurance Company (Limited); The Nova Scotia Land and Gold Crushing and Amalgamating Company (Limited); The General Trading Company (Limited); The Wiltshire Iron Company (Limited); The Hampstead Brewery Company (Limited).

The following circular has been issued by the Inns of Court Hotel Company (Limited):—

"19, Lincoln's Inn Fields, London, W.C.,  
"October 31, 1866.

"Notice is hereby given that an Extraordinary General Meeting of the Company will be held at the Company's Hotel, Holborn, in the County of Middlesex, on Saturday, the 10th day of November next, at 11 o'clock in the morning, at which meeting the following resolution will be proposed:—

"That it has been proved to the satisfaction of the shareholders that the Inns of Court Hotel Company (Limited), cannot, by reason of its liabilities, continue its business, and that it is advisable to wind up the same."

"By order of the Board,

"H. T. L. BEWLEY, Secretary."

**DEVELOPMENT OF WRITING MATERIALS.**—The earliest mode of writing was on bricks, tiles, oyster-shells, stone, ivory, barks and leaves of trees; and from the latter, the term, "leaves of a book," is probably derived. Copper and brass plates were very early in use; and a bill of feoffment on copper was some years since discovered in India, bearing date a hundred years B.C. Leather was also used, as well as wooden tablets. Then the papyrus came into vogue, and about the eighth century the papyrus was superseded by parchment. Paper, however, is of great antiquity, especially amongst the Chinese; but the first paper mill in England was built in 1588 by a German, at Dartford in Kent. Nevertheless, it was nearly a century and a-half, namely, 1713, before Thomas Watkins, a stationer, brought papermaking to anything like perfection. The first approach to a pen was the stylus, a kind of iron bodkin; but the Romans forbade its use on account of its frequent and even fatal use in quarrels; and then it was made of bone. Subsequently reeds pointed and split like pens as in the present day were used; and whatever may be said of our pens and paper on the score of commerce, it is clear from early records that the inks of the ancients were greatly superior to our own.

**A CRITICAL POINT FOR POACHERS.**—On Saturday last, at the Shire-hall, Nottingham, before Mr. Sherbrooke and other magistrates, John Selby was charged with night poaching on the preserves of the Earl of Chesterfield, at Burton Joyce. A game watcher spoke to seeing the prisoner dragging a net at 8 o'clock on the night of the 30th of September. The defence set up by the prisoner's solicitor was that his client was in search of the donkey which had strayed from home, and that the prisoner wandered up to the watcher, who was on his hands and knees, believing him to be the donkey in question. The magistrates said they had no doubt that the offence had been committed, and sentenced the prisoner to a month's hard labour, and to find sureties for twelve months at the expiration of that period. The prisoner's solicitor thereupon submitted that the offence was committed too early in the evening to be night poaching. The magistrates inquired of the police officer into whose charge the prisoner was given the exact time in the evening when he received the man into custody, and he replied half-past seven o'clock. An almanack was brought into requisition to ascertain the time of sunset on the 30th of September, and it was found to be 5.41 p.m. The words of the Act, Mr. Sherbrooke said, were "one hour after sunset," and allowing for a certain period which would elapse between the time of the arrest and the actual commission of the offence, the magistrates thought it was too near a thing upon which to convict, and therefore rescinded their former decision, both as regarded the imprisonment and the sureties, and the prisoner was discharged.

**SITTINGS AT NISI PRIUS.**—The first sittings at Nisi Prius of the three common law courts, in term, are appointed for the 5th instant in Middlesex. There will be no London sittings in term. The sittings after term in Middlesex will commence on the 27th November, and in London, after term, on the 10th December in the Common Pleas and Exchequer, and on the 11th in the Queen's Bench.

**MR. BRETT, M.P., AT HELSTON.**—The Conservative electors of Helston gave a banquet on Thursday week to Mr. Brett, Q.C., in celebration of his return as member for the borough. The banquet was attended by upwards of 250 inhabitants of the borough.

**TRADES UNION OUTRAGES.**—At the meeting of the Sheffield Town Council on Monday, a motion was brought forward for the appointment of a deputation to wait on the Home Secretary with the object of inducing him to issue a Royal Commission to inquire into the late incendiary explosion in Sheffield. The object of the movers and supporters of the proposition is to have a commission with power to examine witnesses on oath, and to give indemnities to persons who may give evidence (if any such should be found) inculpating themselves in this or other outrage. It is not clear that the commission can be issued without the authority of Parliament, and the expectation that the accomplices of the perpetrators of the crime will come forward and give evidence respecting the outrage voluntarily and without the hope of reward, after the offer of an unprecedented sum has failed to bring them out, is obviously futile. These matters are managed, as the public and the police have too good reason to suspect, with a secrecy and skill that defy detection; but it is no doubt highly desirable that, if any light can be thrown on the actual outrage by an independent inquiry, that inquiry should take place. The defence of the trades' unions which Mr. Thomas Hughes, M.P., has published has excited a good deal of astonishment here. Until an outrage of equal atrocity shall occur in the house of a unionist the town will continue to use the generic title which it has given to these crimes—namely, "trades' union outrages." The explosions arise out of "rattennings" which have not had the effect they were intended to have. If a grinder leaves the Union he may make up his mind that "Mary Ann" will come in the night to his "wheel" and take away his wheelbands, and throw him out of work. If that gentle coercion proves insufficient, personal violence is resorted to, or his house is blown up about his ears. The former mode is adopted with great success with defaulting union men; and it is understood that if they call upon the trade secretary and "pay up"—a small sum being added "for the expense of removing the bands"—a note will come from "Mary Ann," telling them where their bands may be "found." These things are of everyday occurrence. Only on Saturday, in the Sheffield Bankruptcy Court, a cutlery manufacturer attributed his bankruptcy to the fact that the "Committee of the Union" had twice "called his men out" and put a stop to his business. Several instances have occurred lately where a number of men have been reduced to compulsory idleness by the removal of their working tools, owing to a dispute between their employers and the Union. It is also notorious that if any person is arrested for any trade offence, no matter how poor he may be, there are always large funds wherewith to defend him. Until these traces of their complicity disappear it will be idle for the Sawgrinders', or the Fendergrinders', or any other Union to lay *ex parte* statements before Mr. Hughes or any other Member of Parliament with the view of obtaining an acquittal before the tribunal of public opinion. At the Council meeting, the proposition having been moved and seconded, Alderman Vickers expressed approval of the project on the ground that it would in all probability do what the large reward had failed to do. The resolution was carried, and the deputation will take steps to obtain an interview with the Home Secretary as early as possible.

**THE EDMUNDS SCANDAL AND THE PATENT OFFICE.**—The *Mining Journal* states that the investigation of the Edmunds scandal has not removed all cause for complaint as to the management of the Patent Office. Owing to the peculiar constitution of the office abuses have crept in which in any other Government department would be impossible. Whilst the working bees of the establishment receive by no means exorbitant salaries, it is complained that salaries of exterior offices have been specially created for abridgers, translators, &c., the relations and *protégés* of those in power. It was originally ordered that certain abridgments of specifications should be made, and as not more than three per hour can be properly abridged, 7s. each is allowed for them. At first the work was fairly done, and as the *employés* were chiefly barristers, with time on their hands, there was little ground for complaint. Since then extracting has been substituted for the making of abstracts, and the privilege of earning £1 ls. per hour has been even less fairly dispensed; close connection with the heads of office, or with the law officers, or their chief clerks being apparently requisite to ensure preferment. It is considered most desirable that the Commissioners of Patents should cast their eyes in this direction.

**THE NEW LEGAL CHANGES.**—By the elevation of Sir Hugh Cairns to a lord justiceship a valuable addition will be made to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which for some time past (numerically speaking) has been rather weak. During the forthcoming November sittings this learned judge will not be able to take much part in the deliberations of this Court, owing to having been long retained as leading counsel in some of the most important cases set down for hearing at their next meeting, but in all probability the long list of arrears will be disposed of before Christmas, and the Court will be able to commence their sittings after Hilary term with an entirely new list.

**THE COUNCIL OF LAW REPORTING.**—By the elevation of Sir Hugh Cairns to the Bench he has ceased to be a member of

the Council of Law Reporting, and Mr. Roll, having been appointed Attorney-General, is now an *ex officio* member in his stead.

## ESTATE EXCHANGE REPORT.

### AT THE NEW AUCTION MART.

Oct. 19.—By Messrs. FAREBROTHER, LYE, & WHEELER.

Leasehold residence, No. 317, Vauxhall-bridge-road; let at £60 per annum; term 5½ years unexpired, at £15 per annum—Sold for £750.

Leasehold residence, No. 319, Vauxhall-bridge-road; term, ground-rent, and rental, similar to above—Sold for £750.

Leasehold residence, No. 323, Vauxhall-bridge-road; let at £70 per annum; term similar to above at £10 per annum—Sold for £700.

Leasehold 3 houses, Nos. 1 to 3, Wilton-terrace, Vauxhall-bridge-road; term similar to above at £21 per annum—Sold for £1,600.

Oct. 30.—By Messrs. NORTON, TRIST, & CO.

Freehold, 2 residences, known as Hawthorn-villas, Buckhurst-hill, producing £45 per annum—Sold for £660.

Copyhold, the Hope Coffeshouse, No. 108, Ratcliff-highway, let on lease at £48 per annum—Sold for £650.

Freehold plot of building land, fronting Blackthorn-street, Bromley—Sold for £35.

Freehold plot of building land, fronting Blackthorn-street, Bromley—Sold for £35.

Freehold plot of building land, fronting Blackthorn-street, Bromley—Sold for £45.

Freehold plot of building land, fronting Fern-street, Bromley—Sold for £50.

Freehold plot of building land, fronting Fern-street, Bromley—Sold for £40.

By Messrs. DANIEL SMITH, SON, & OAKLEY.

Freehold, 20 houses and shops, situate in South-street, Southampton-street, Camberwell, producing £310 per annum—Sold for £2,600.

By Messrs. DEBENHAM, TEWSON, & FARMER.

Freehold, residence, known as Fern-hill Lodge, Upper Hale, Farnham, Surrey—Sold for £900.

### AT THE MASONS' HALL TAVERN.

Oct. 22.—By Messrs. BARTON & SON.

Freehold plot of building land, in Denmark-street, Camberwell New-road—Sold for £400.

Freehold plot of building land, in Denmark-street, Camberwell New-road—Sold for £150.

Freehold messuage, No. 2, Somerset-cottages, Denmark-street—Sold for £265.

Freehold messuage, No. 1, Somerset-cottages, Denmark-street—Sold for £210.

## BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

### BIRTHS.

JESSEL.—On Oct. 27, at Brighton, the wife of George Jessel, Esq., Q.C., of a son.

SIDDALL.—On Oct. 27, at Farm-hill, Essex, the wife of J. W. F. Siddall, Esq., Solicitor, of a daughter.

### MARRIAGES.

FREEMANTLE—ISAACS.—On Aug. 31, at St. John's, Darlinghurst, Sydney, Commander E. R. Freemantle, Bart., to Barberina, daughter of the Hon. Robt. M. Isaacs, Solicitor-General of New South Wales.

RICHARDS—WHARTON.—On Oct. 30, at Trinity Church, St. Marylebone, E. V. Richards, Esq., York-terrace, Regent's-park, and of the Temple, to Elizabeth A., daughter of the late Robert Wharton, Esq., of the Temple.

### DEATHS.

BROWNE.—On Oct. 28, Elizabeth, daughter of G. L. Browne, Esq., Barrister, aged 21 months.

NAPIER.—On Oct. 27, at Woburn-square, Catherine J., daughter of the late William Napier, Esq., W. S., Edinburgh.

## UNCLAIMED STOCK IN THE BANK OF ENGLAND.

The amount of Stock heretofore standing in the following Names will be transferred to the Parties claiming the same, unless other Claimants appear within Three Months:—

FYFE, McDUFF, Portroy, N.B., Esq., deceased. £4337s. 9d., Consolidated £3 per Cent. Annuities.—Claimed by Eliza Forbes, Spinster, administratrix.

## LONDON GAZETTES.

### Winding-up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, Oct. 26, 1866.

### LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Aspatia Benefit Building Society.—Petition for winding up, presented Oct. 23, directed to be heard before Vice-Chancellor Stuart on the first day to be appointed for hearing petitions in Michaelmas Term. Hayton & Simpson, Cookernmouth, solicitors for the petitioners.

Saloon Steam Packet Company (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented Sept. 21, directed to be heard before Vice-Chancellor Wood on the next petition day. Wickens, Tokenhouse-yard, solicitor for the petitioners.

Petroleum Company of Western Virginia (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented Oct. 24, directed to be heard before the Master of the Rolls on the next petition day. Harrison & Lewis, Old Jewry, solicitors for the petitioner.

Pile, Spence, & Company (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented Oct. 26, directed to be heard before the Master of the Rolls on Nov. 3. Scott, King William-st., solicitor for the company.

Patent File Company (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented

Oct 2, directed to be heard before Vice-Chancellor Stuart on Nov. 3. Crowdy, Sergeant's-inn, Fleet-st, solicitor for the petitioner.

TUESDAY, Oct. 30, 1866.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Leeswood Iron Company (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented Oct 26, directed to be heard before the Master of the Rolls on Nov 10. Walker & Co, Chester, solicitors for the petitioners.

Inns of Court Hotel Company (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented Oct 29, directed to be heard before the Master of the Rolls on Nov 10. Lumley, Sackville-st, Piccadilly, solicitor for the petitioner.

General Trading Company (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented Oct 29, directed to be heard before Vice-Chancellor Stuart on Nov 9. Pulbrook, Threadneedle-st, solicitor for the petitioners.

Hampstead Brewery Company (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented Oct 30, directed to be heard before Vice-Chancellor Kindersley on Nov 16. Wood, Bucklersbury, solicitor for the petitioner.

Granite and Hard Stone Working Company (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented Oct 25, directed to be heard before Vice-Chancellor Stuart on Nov 9. Mathews & Co, Leadenhall-st, solicitors for the petitioners.

Financial Insurance Company (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented Oct 29, directed to be heard before Vice-Chancellor Stuart on Nov 9. Harrison & Lewis, solicitors for the petitioner.

Wiltshire Iron Company (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented Oct 30, directed to be heard before Vice-Chancellor Stuart on Nov 9. Pulbrook, Threadneedle-st, solicitor for the petitioner.

Nova Scotia Land and Gold Crushing and Amalgamating Company (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented Oct 30, directed to be heard before the Master of the Rolls on Nov 10. Bateson & Co, Lpool, solicitors for the petitioners.

Colonial and General Gas Company (Limited).—Vice-Chancellor Stuart, acting for Vice-Chancellor Wood, has by an order, dated Oct 26, appointed Charles Fryse, Birmingham, and James Thomas Snell, Gresham-st, to be provisional official liquidators.

### Friendly Societies Dissolved.

TUESDAY, Oct. 30, 1866.

National Shipwrights' Friendly Society, Hibernian Schools, Pleasant-st, Lpool, Oct 23.

Sywell Benefit Society, School-room, Sywell, Northampton, Oct 25.

### Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

FRIDAY, Oct. 26, 1866.

Acton, John, Manx. Nov 22. Simpson, Manx.

Adams, Robt, Leeds, Sharebroker. Dec 23. North & Sons.

Cleweley, Ann Mary, Hackney-rd, Trimming Manufacturer. Dec 25.

Donne, Prince's-st, Spitalfields.

Farquhar, Thos Newman, Moorgate-st, Esq. Feb 1. Lyne & Holman, Austinfrans.

Fawcett, Thos, Sedbergh, York, Esq. Dec 1. Barra, Jun, Esq.

Foulblaque, John Saml Martin, Brighton. Jan 1. Jaquet, Sergeant's-inn, Temple.

Kettman, Hy, Church-st, Bethnal-green, Port Butcher. Dec 10.

McKend, Wm, Brook-st, Hanover-sq, Esq. Nov 30. Simpson & Collingford, Gracechurch-st.

Moore, Rev Wm, Spalding, Lincoln. Jan 31. Moore & Peake, Sleaford.

Morley, Thos, Lancaster, Surgeon. Dec 7. Buckley, Oldham.

Nelson, Rev John, Beeston-next-Mileham, Norfolk, Clerk. Nov 22.

Cooper & Son, East Dereham.

Newland, Mary, Stratford-upon-Avon, Warwick, Spinster. Dec 26.

Hobbes & Co, Stratford-upon-Avon.

Newton, Wm, Gloucester, Gent. Dec 20. J. & H. T. Lovegrove, Gloucester.

Pattison, Thos, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Merchant. Dec 5. Spours & Carr, Alnwick.

Smith, Joseph Mayer, Mentone, France, Gent. Dec 1. Baker & Key, Cloak-lane.

Thornton, Claude Geo, Marden-hill, Hertford, Esq. Jan 1. Domville & Co, New-sq, Lincoln's-inn.

Willis, Fras, Askew-rd, Hammersmith, Builder. Nov 30. Simpson & Collingford, Gracechurch-st.

TUESDAY, Oct. 30, 1866.

Ashwin, Richd, Aldington, Worcester, Gent. Jan 1. Eades, Evesham.

Bucknall, Richd Corfield, Gloucester-pl, Greenwich, Esq. Jan 1.

Eldale & Byrne, Whitehall-pl.

Day, Wm, Peer's Cooperage, Cornwall-rd. Nov 10. Courtenay & Croome, Gracechurch-st.

Greenroyd, Jas, Bracken Bed, Overden, York, Farmer. Dec 1. Hill, Halifax.

Holden, Mary, Rusholme, Manch, Spinster. Dec 31. Jepsen, Manch.

Holden, Ann, Rusholme, Manch, Widow. Dec 31. Jepsen, Manch.

Holden, Sarah Ann, Rusholme, Manch, Spinster. Dec 31. Jepsen, Manch.

Howell, Josiah Thos, Tewkesbury, Gloucester, Accountant. Dec. 5.

Cooke, Newent.

Jones, Thos, Mold, Flint, Tallow Chandler. Dec 1. Kelly & Co, Mold.

Kerby, John, Yarrowcombe, Devon, Gent. Dec 1. Clarke & Lukin, Chard.

McGlashan, John, Middleborough, York, Surgeon. Nov 23. Thompson, Middleborough.

Pollard, Thos, Lpool, Marine Store Dealer. Nov 25. Holden, Lpool.

Ryan, Richd, Haikford, Lancaster, Licensed Victualler. Nov 17.

Abtherton, Manch.

Worthington, Margaret, Rusholme, Lancaster, Spinster. Jan 1. Parry & Son, Manch.

Orders registered pursuant to Bankruptcy Act, 1861.

FRIDAY, Oct. 26, 1866.

Adney, John, Rowton, Salop, Farmer. Sept 29. Conv. Reg Oct 25.

Araman, Hanna, Manch, Merchant. Sept 28. Comp. Reg Oct 23.

Bellamy, Joseph, & Thos Bellamy, Leamington Priors, Warwick, Furniture Brokers. Sept 26. Comp. Reg Oct 23.

Barton, Richd, Taddington, Beds, Draper. Oct 24. Comp. Reg Oct 26.

Bishop, Robt, Regent's-pk-ter, Gloucester-gate, Gent. Sept 27. Comp. Reg Oct 23.

Blackham, Oliver Gaisford, Birm, General Factor. Oct 24. Comp. Reg Oct 26.

Bolderstone, Wm, Garston, nr Lpool, Grocer. Oct 24. Comp. Reg Oct 26.

Bowyer, Edgar, Cowper-rd, Hornsey New Town, Wholesale Milliner. Oct 9. Comp. Reg Oct 19.

Briggs, Saml, Manch, Washing Machine Maker. Sept 29. Asst. Reg Oct 26.

Bucknall, Hy Wm, Lpool, Wine Merchant. Oct 5. Asst. Reg Oct 26.

Buddle, Thos Shepherd, Alnwick, Northumberland, Cabinet Maker. Oct 8. Asst. Reg Oct 26.

Castrique, Louis, Fenchurch-st, Merchant. Oct 20. Comp. Reg Oct 24.

Chase, Wm, Meadow-st, Stoke Newington, Cowkeeper. Oct 15. Comp. Reg Oct 24.

Cook, John Stephenson, Leeds, Provision Merchant. Oct 12. Asst. Reg Oct 24.

Cranshaw, Elijah, Ratcliff-bridge, Lancaster, Grocer. Sept 28. Conv. Reg Oct 24.

Davis, Saml Worthy, Temple Combe, Somerset, Yeoman. Sept 25. Asst. Reg Oct 23.

Dawson, Nicholas, Crisp-st, Poplar, Linen Draper. Oct 11. Asst. Reg Oct 24.

Dex, Balthazar, Esmond-rd, Old Ford, Baker. Sept 24. Comp. Reg Oct 22.

Dowse, Robt Hy, Stickney, Lincoln, Wheelwright. Oct 2. Asst. Reg Oct 23.

Duffill, Wm, Beverley, York, Innkeeper. Sept 29. Asst. Reg Oct 25.

Edwards, Joseph Wm, Bunbury, Chester, Innkeeper. Oct 24. Comp. Reg Oct 25.

Fenwick, John, jun, Northallerton, York, Farmer. Oct 10. Asst. Reg Oct 25.

Gath, Wm Benj, Lpool, Spinner. Oct 12. Comp. Reg Oct 24.

Giles, Cornelius, Warminster, Wilt, Draper. Oct 2. Asst. Reg Oct 23.

Gillard, John, Portland-rd, Notting-hill, Tailor. Oct 20. Comp. Reg Oct 23.

Gregory, Chas, Shadwell-rd, Grove-rd, Holloway, Builder. Oct 22. Comp. Reg Oct 26.

Hall, Wm, Birm, Oil and Color Maker. Oct 23. Comp. Reg Oct 26.

Hanson, Jas, Bradford, York, Editor. Sept 29. Asst. Reg Oct 26.

Hutchins, Chas Blyth, Hatcham, Surrey, Gent. Oct 18. Comp. Reg Oct 25.

Harper, Hy, Smethwick, Stafford, Woollen Draper. Oct 17. Comp. Reg Oct 25.

Hopstall, Thos, Lpool, Estate Agent. Oct 17. Comp. Reg Oct 25.

Hodson, Joseph Awry, Burslem, Stafford, Wine and Spirit Merchant. Sept 29. Comp. Reg Oct 26.

Hughes, Fredk Rumohr, Lpool, Wool Merchant. Oct 23. Comp. Reg Oct 25.

Ingham, Jas Warren, Salford, Lancaster, Beer Retailer. Oct 9. Comp. Reg Oct 24.

Johnson, Thos, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Grocer. Oct 12. Comp. Reg Oct 25.

Kewley, Philip, Everton, Lancaster, Licensed Victualler. Oct 15. Comp. Reg Oct 26.

Knight, Eliz, Lymington, Southampton, Schoolmistress. Oct 8. Asst. Reg Oct 23.

Lee, Saml, Sheffield, Dealer in Sewing Machines. Sept 29. Comp. Reg Oct 25.

Lindsay, Hugh Hamilton, Sevenoaks, Kent, Merchant. May 1. Asst. Reg Oct 25.

Lindsay, Hugh Hamilton, Robt Crawford Antrobus, Alex Michie, & John Springfield Robison, Shanghai, China, Merchants. May 1. Asst. Reg Oct 25.

Lingard, Chas, Sheffield, Scissor Manufacturer. Oct 19. Asst. Reg Oct 25.

Mare, Chas John, Gt St Helen's, Ship Builder. Oct 18. Comp. Reg Oct 23.

Martin, Wm, Amberley-rd, Paddington, Farrier. Oct 15. Comp. Reg Oct 26.

Martin, Wm Russell, Birm, out of business. Sept 27. Comp. Reg Oct 23.

McDougle, Wm, & Chas Allwork, Commercial-st, Printers. Oct 23. Comp. Reg Oct 26.

Mitchell, John, Darlington, Durham, Draper. Sept 25. Comp. Reg Oct 23.

Moulard, Jas, Mitcham, Surrey, Pawnbroker. Oct 22. Comp. Reg Oct 26.

Oliver, Wm John, Manch, Gutta Percha Manufacturer. Oct 2. Comp. Reg Oct 25.

O'Neill, John, Birm, Horse Dealer. Oct 24. Comp. Reg Oct 26.

Parker, Thos, & Reuben Parker, Liversedge, York, Blanket Manufacturers. Oct 3. Asst. Reg Oct 25.

Pierce, John Crutall Musgrave, Manch, Comm Agent. Oct 16. Comp. Reg Oct 25.

Pollard, Chas, Strand, Licensed Victualler. Oct 18. Comp. Reg Oct 25.

Poole, Thos Edwd, Clifton-upon-Dunsmore, Warwick, Travelling Sorter. Oct 15. Comp. Reg Oct 25.

Priestley, Richd Burrows, Halifax, York, Printer. Oct 6. Comp. Reg Oct 25.

Puntis, Josiah, Southampton, House Decorator. Oct 25. Comp. Reg Oct 26.

Reynolds, Jabez, Brighton, Builder. Oct 6. Inspectorship. Reg Oct 25.

Ride, Jacob, Birm, Victualler. Oct 10. Asst. Reg Oct 26.

Sabey, Chas, Edward-st, City-rd, Carpenter. Oct 4. Comp. Reg Oct 25.

Shirley, Fredk, & Thos Morley, Bishop's-rd, Victoria-park, Painters. Oct 8. Comp. Reg Oct 23.



Shittler, Wm Rowden, Bishopstone, Wilts, Farmer. Sept 28. Asst. Reg Oct 25.  
 Smith, Geo, Landport, Hants, Ironmonger. Oct 25. Comp. Reg Oct 26.  
 Staal, Levy Myer, White's-row, Spitalfields, Felt Hat Manufacturer. Oct 15. Comp. Reg Oct 23.  
 Stevenson, Geo Wacey, Bouveris-st, Comm Agent. Oct 5. Comp. Reg Oct 26.  
 Taylor, Christopher Jas, Handsworth, Srafford, Wine Merchant. Oct 10. Comp. Reg Oct 25.  
 Trigg, Geo, Carshalton, Surrey, Builder. Sept 29. Asst. Reg Oct 25.  
 Tweedale, Jas, Clegg-hall Mills, Abraham Alfred Tweedale, Spring-cottage, & Saml Tweedale, Clegg-hall Mills, nr Rochdale, Lancaster, Cotton Spinners. Sept 29. Asst. Reg Oct 25.  
 Veal, Geo, Walsall, Stafford, Licensed Victualler. Sept 28. Comp. Reg Oct 23.  
 Wade, Clark, Felthorpe, Norfolk, Ironfounder. Sept 29. Asst. Reg Oct 24.  
 Walker, John Bettoney, Nottingham, Hatter. Sept 29. Comp. Reg Oct 25.

TUESDAY, Oct. 30, 1866.

Anderson, Wm, Craven-st, City-rd, Engineer. Oct 9. Comp. Reg Oct 29.  
 Baker, Joseph, sen, & Joseph Baker, jun, Lower Vale-pl, Hammer-smith, Tailors. Oct 9. Comp. Reg Oct 30.  
 Baker, Worth, Bath, Licensed Victualler. Oct 25. Asst. Reg Oct 29.  
 Batkin, Edwin, Birm, Chandelier Manufacturer. Oct 25. Asst. Reg Oct 27.  
 Bean, Alex, Harrogate, York, Grocer. Oct 19. Comp. Reg Oct 27.  
 Bishop, John, New-st, Covent-garden, Grocer. Oct 2. Asst. Reg Oct 29.  
 Booth, Geo, Clyde-pl, Forest-hill, out of business. Sept 29. Comp. Reg Oct 26.  
 Brown, Wm, Fenchurch-st, West India Merchant. Oct 1. Comp. Reg Oct 29.  
 Cantor, Jacob, Gt Dover-st, Watchmaker. Oct 25. Comp. Reg Oct 30.  
 Chatburn, Jas, & Walker Chatburn, Hebden Bridge, York, Cotton Manufacturers. Oct 13. Asst. Reg Oct 29.  
 Clark, Wm, Masborough, York, Coke Maker. Oct 2. Asst. Reg Oct 29.  
 Dalzell, John Elder, Elgin-rd, Kensington-pk, Doctor of Medicine. Oct 26. Comp. Reg Oct 30.  
 Darwin, John, Surbiton, Surrey, Builder. Sept 28. Comp. Reg Oct 25.  
 Dunsford, Peter, Willington, Durham, Grocer. Oct 2. Comp. Reg Oct 29.  
 Edlin, Vernon, Burlington-rd, Westbourne-pk, Clerk in Holy Orders. Oct 26. Comp. Reg Oct 29.  
 Edwards, John, Aylaham, Norfolk, Earthenware Dealer. Oct 3. Asst. Reg Oct 30.  
 Ellis, Jas, Sheffield, Tool Maker. Oct 3. Asst. Reg Oct 29.  
 Elliston, Benj, Addenbrooke, Croydon, Cambridge, Farmer. Oct 1. Comp. Reg Oct 27.  
 Forty, Thos, Princes-rd, Notting-hill, Cheesemonger. Oct 4. Comp. Reg Oct 27.  
 Foster, John, St John's-pl, Kensington, Zinc Plumber. Oct 25. Comp. Reg Oct 27.  
 German, Thos, Lime-st, Grocer. Oct 3. Asst. Reg Oct 30.  
 Glover, Joseph, Lpool, Master Mariner. Oct 3. Comp. Reg Oct 26.  
 Hale, Jas, West Derby, Lancaster, Blacksmith. Oct 2. Asst. Reg Oct 30.  
 Harris, Jas, & Jas Arundell Davey, Mount-row, Liverpool-rd, Boot-makers. Oct 9. Asst. Reg Oct 27.  
 Harris, Richd, Bovey Tracey, Devon, Miller. Oct 17. Comp. Reg Oct 30.  
 Havelock, Wm, Scarborough, York, Innkeeper. Oct 3. Asst. Reg Oct 30.  
 Hazell, Mark, St Woollos, Monmouth, Builder. Oct 5. Asst. Reg Oct 29.  
 Hentley, Geo, Bradford, York, Comm Agent. Oct 12. Asst. Reg Oct 27.  
 Holland, Richd Leigh, & Wm Hy Thompson, Gt St Helen's, Merchants. Oct 17. Inspectorship. Reg Oct 26.  
 Loader, Geo Forie, Southampton, Grocer. Oct 9. Asst. Reg Oct 26.  
 Louch, Chas, jun, Landport, Southampton, Draper. Oct 1. Comp. Reg Oct 27.  
 Lukeman, Benj, Leamington Priors, Warwick, Tailor. Oct 5. Asst. Reg Oct 30.  
 Magnus, Edwd, & Henry Magnus, St. Mary Axe, Shoe Manufacturers. Oct 19. Comp. Reg Oct 29.  
 Mansell, Wm, Watlington, Kensington-gate, Financial Agent. Oct 1. Comp. Reg Oct 29.  
 Marriott, Wm, Bristol, Licensed Victualler. Oct 18. Comp. Reg Oct 29.  
 Martin, Hy, Church-st, Camberwell, Bookseller. Oct 19. Comp. Reg Oct 29.  
 Midwinter, Chas, Lucas-pl, Commercial-rd East, Watchmaker. Comp. Oct 9. Reg Oct 26.  
 Morgan, Jehoida, Portsmouth, Messman. Sept 22. Comp. Reg Oct 27.  
 Nathan, Nathan, Bow-st, Covent-garden, Fruit Salesman. Oct 27. Comp. Reg Oct 29.  
 Palmer, John, Markham-sq, Chelsea, Builder. Oct 30. Comp. Reg Oct 27.  
 Parr, Thos Coddington, Mincing-lane, Gent. Oct 9. Asst. Reg Oct 27.  
 Pear, Louisa, Welbeck-st, Cavendish-sq, Widow. Oct 13. Comp. Reg Oct 27.  
 Pear, Louisa, jun, Welbeck-st, Cavendish-sq, Spinster. Oct 13. Comp. Reg Oct 27.  
 Petch, Wm, North Fordingham, York, Joiner. Oct 13. Asst. Reg Oct 29.  
 Pigott, Jas, Caledonian-rd, Islington, Leather Seller. Sept 29. Comp. Reg Oct 27.  
 Pratt, Wm, Sunderland, Durham, Licensed Victualler. Oct 16. Comp. Reg Oct 27.  
 Rabbotts, Chas, Hargrove Farm, Stalbridge, Dorset, Yeoman. Oct 2. Asst. Reg Oct 27.

Renshaw, Wm, Dover, Kent, Timber Merchant. Oct 5. Asst. Reg Oct 30.  
 Roberts, Isaac, Devonport, Devon, Ironmonger. Oct 27. Comp. Reg Oct 30.  
 Rockhill, Isaac, Yoxford, Suffolk, Innkeeper. Oct 9. Asst. Reg Oct 29.  
 Sauer, Geo Alfred, James-st, Old Kent-rd, Potato Salesman. Oct 22. Comp. Reg Oct 29.  
 Sheldon, Joseph, Sheffield, Provision Dealer. Oct 5. Asst. Reg Oct 27.  
 Simpson, Mercer Hampson, jun, Birm, Theatrical Proprietor. Sept 1. Comp. Reg Oct 27.  
 Smith, John Edwin, Throgmorton-st, Tailor. Oct 5. Asst. Reg Oct 27.  
 Spindler, Hy, St George's-pl, Knightsbridge, Hosier. Oct 9. Comp. Reg Oct 27.  
 Stead, Richd, Dalton, York, Shirt Manufacturer. Oct 8. Asst. Reg Oct 26.  
 Stevens, Richd, Montague-pl, Poplar, Builder. Oct 18. Comp. Reg Oct 26.  
 Stood, John Thos, Birm, Lamp Manufacturer. Sept 28. Inspectorship. Reg Oct 23.  
 Swiney, Bryan, Studley-ter, Clapham, out of business. Oct 29. Comp. Reg Oct 30.  
 Tye, John, Lincoln, Engineer. Oct 22. Comp. Reg Oct 27.  
 Walker, Susannah, Leeds, Milliner. Oct 9. Comp. Reg Oct 26.  
 Weeks, Jas, Portsea, Hants, Shipwright. Oct 26. Asst. Reg Oct 29.  
 Welch, John, Birm, Coal Dealer. Oct 2. Asst. Reg Oct 29.  
 West, John, Princes Riborough, Bucks, Baker. Sept 29. Comp. Reg Oct 27.  
 Winton, Chas, Cow Cross-st, West Smithfield, Saddler's Ironmonger. Sept 29. Comp. Reg Oct 27.  
 Wilkinson, Wm Joseph, Kingston-upon-Hull, Machinery Broker. Sept 29. Comp. Reg Oct 26.  
 Williams, David, Sussex-pl, Picnic, Grocer. Oct 9. Comp. Reg Oct 27.  
 Wright, Thos, Shrewsbury, Salop, Travelling Draper. Oct 1. Asst. Reg Oct 27.

Bankrupts.

Friday, Oct. 26, 1866.

To Surrender in London.

Allison, Forbes Fortune, Brixton-hill, Surrey, Comm Merchant. Adj Oct 19. Nov 19 at 11. Aldridge.  
 Andrews, Alfred, Northampton, Leather Seller. Adj Oct 19. Nov 7 at 2.  
 Bacon, John Joseph, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Oct 22. Nov 14 at 12. Keane, Lincoln's-inn-fields.  
 Barton, Fredk, Twickenham, Dealer in Teas. Adj Oct 19. Nov 19 at 11. Aldridge.  
 Beere, Geo, Tadmarton, nr Banbury, Oxford, Farmer. Pet Oct 23. Nov 14 at 1. Munday, Basinghall-st.  
 Bonham, Thos, Fargeter, Winslow, Buckingham, Butcher. Pet Oct 22. Nov 14 at 11. Risley & Stoker, Gray's-inn-sq.  
 Burton, Peter, Carlisle-ter, Kensington, Stonemason. Pet Oct 13. Nov 12 at 2. Harrison & Lewis, Old Jewry.  
 Butler, Richd, Market-st, Paddington, Smith. Pet Oct 24. Nov 14 at 1. George, Bury-st, St James's.  
 Carpenter, Richards Watkins, Isleworth, Grocer. Pet Oct 24. Nov 14 at 1. Spicer, Staple-inn.  
 Carter, Saml, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Oct 22. Nov 14 at 11. Goadley.  
 Chaffers, Alex, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj Oct 19. Nov 19 at 11. Aldridge.  
 Churchill, Saml, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj Oct 19. Nov 19 at 11. Aldridge.  
 Collins, David, Reddington, Surrey, Baker. Pet Oct 22. Nov 14 at 11. Daniels & Co, Fore-st, City.  
 Day, John, Heath Farm, Beacontree Heath, Dagenham, Market Gardener. Pet Oct 22. Nov 14 at 12. Newman, Bucklebury.  
 Dobell, Daniel, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj Oct 30. Nov 19 at 2. Aldridge.  
 Ede, Hy Huthorns, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj Oct 19. Nov 19 at 11. Aldridge.  
 Elliott, John Watts, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj Oct 19. Nov 19 at 12. Aldridge.  
 Flint, Wm, Pancras-st, Tottenham-et-rd, Beer-house Keeper. Pet Oct 22. Nov 12 at 1. Towne, Gt Russell-st, Bloomsbury.  
 Fontana, Annibale, Bolgrave-ter, Picnic, Sculptor. Pet Oct 23. Nov 14 at 12. Whyte & Collinson, Russell-sq.  
 Glaser, Saul, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj Oct 19. Nov 19 at 1. Aldridge.  
 Griffiths, Richd Wm, South-sq, Gray's-inn, Surveyor. Pet Oct 20. Nov 12 at 1. Linklaters & Co, Walbrook.  
 Haefner, Fritz, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj Oct 19. Nov 18 at 12. Aldridge.  
 Hamblion, Hy, Colchester, Essex, Licensed Victualler. Pet Oct 22. Nov 12 at 1. Jones, Colchester.  
 Harrowsmith, Benj, Francis-st, Woolwich, Upholsterer. Pet Oct 24. Nov 12 at 3. Lewis & Lewis, Ely-pl.  
 Hawkins, Walter, Flint-st, East-st, Walworth, Carpenter. Pet Oct 24. Nov 14 at 11. Calvert, Chancery-lane.  
 Henriquez, Noel, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj Oct 20. Nov 19 at 2. Aldridge.  
 Hill, Joseph, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj Oct 19. Nov 19 at 1. Aldridge.  
 Haymann, Hermann, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj Oct 19. Nov 19 at 12. Aldridge.  
 Howlett, Wm, Thame, Oxford, Wheelwright. Pet Oct 23. Nov 7 at 2. Harrison & Lewis, Old Jewry.  
 Lockett, Walford Charles, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj Oct 19. Nov 19 at 12. Aldridge.  
 Marshall, Thos John, Wheel-alloy, Bishopsgate Without, Engineer. Pet Oct 20. Nov 6 at 1. Fereday, Bedford-row.  
 Meager, Geo, Croydon, Baker. Pet Oct 23. Nov 14 at 12. Farry, Croydon.  
 Meier, Wolf, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj Oct 19. Nov 19 at 12. Aldridge.  
 Mitchell, Hy Geo, Greenwich, out of employment. Pet Oct 24. Nov 14 at 1. Harrison, Basinghall-st.

Moody, Hy, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Oct 23. Nov 14 at 1.  
Taylor, John-st, Bedford-row.  
Palmer, Edw Geo, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Oct 23 (for pau).  
Nov 12 at 11. Hicks, Moorgate-st.  
Platt, Wm, Beaufort-bldgs, Strand, Working Jeweller. Pet Oct 24.  
Nov 14 at 1. Beverley, Coleman-st.  
Robinson Wm, Arlington-st, New North-rd, Islington, out of business.  
Pet Oct 22. Nov 14 at 11. Oliver, King-street, Cheapside.  
Slann, Cornelius Blanchard, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Oct 22  
(for pau). Nov 6 at 1. Goatley, Bow-st, Covent-garden.  
Sparrow, Geo Young, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj Oct 20. Nov  
19 at 2. Aldridge.  
Spragge, Wm, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj Oct 20. Nov 19 at 2.  
Aldridge.  
Tilley, Jas John, Surrey-sq, Old Kent-rd, out of business. Pet Oct 22  
(for pau). Nov 12 at 2. Peek & Downing, Basinghall-st.  
Walker, Fredk Jas, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Sept 28. Nov 7  
at 2. Dobie, Basinghall-st.  
Walton, Hy Tinniswood, Newman-st, Oxford-st, Looking-glass  
Manufacturer. Pet Oct 22. Nov 14 at 12. Peek & Downing,  
Basinghall-st.  
Williamson, Benjamin, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj Oct 19. Nov  
19 at 1. Aldridge.  
Willia, Geo Alfred, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj Oct 19. Nov 19  
at 1. Aldridge.  
Young, Wm Hy, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj Oct 19. Nov 19 at  
1. Aldridge.

#### To Surrender in the Country.

Bamkin, Fras Simpson, Derby, Licensed Victualler. Pet Oct 23.  
Birm, Nov 6 at 11. Briggs, Derby.  
Bates, Geo, Birm, Fruiterer. Pet Oct 22. Birm, Nov 23 at 10. Allen,  
Birm.  
Bennett, Robt, Yeovil, Somerset, Beerhouse Keeper. Pet Oct 15.  
Yeovil, Nov 9 at 11. Slade, Yeovil.  
Bullock, Chas, Longton, Stafford, China Manufacturer. Pet Oct 13.  
Birm, Nov 7 at 12. Young & Greenfield, Longton.  
Butt, John, Lincoln, Chemist. Pet Oct 22. Lincoln, Nov 9 at 11.  
Rex, Lincoln.  
Butterton, Geo Enoch, Shiffnal, Salop, Farmer. Pet Oct 10. Birm,  
Nov 9 at 12. Hodgson & Son, Birm.  
Carruthers, Joseph, Prisoner for Debt, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Pet  
Oct 23 (for pau). Newcastle, Nov 10 at 10.  
Castle, Thos, Leamington Priors, Warwick, Provision Dealer. Pet  
June 19 (for pau). Warwick, Nov 10 at 11.  
Clifford, Chas, Hanbury, Stafford, Beerseller. Pet Oct 20. Burton,  
Nov 14 at 1. Smith, Derby.  
Coles, Edwin, Althampton, Somerset, Baker. Pet Oct 20. Wells, Nov  
3 at 12. Read, Bridgwater.  
Cooke, Geo, Norwich, no business. Pet Oct 22. Beccles, Nov. 10 at 10.  
Hartcup, Bungay.  
Cummings, Jas, Wembdon, Somerset, out of trade. Pet Oct 22.  
Bridgwater, Nov 7 at 10. Reed, Bridgwater.  
Dickson, Benj, Whitehaven, Cumberland, Boot Salesman. Pet Oct 23.  
Whitehaven, Nov 6 at 10. Mason, Whitehaven.  
Fielden, Leonard, Prisoner for Debt, Lancaster. Adj Oct 17. Bolton,  
Nov 7 at 10. Watt, Bolton.  
Fletcher, Jas, Dudley, Worcester, Grocer. Pet Oct 9. Dudley, Nov 8  
at 11. Stokes, Dudley.  
Gibson, Wm Purdon, Newland-gate, Howden, York, Farmer. Pet Oct  
23. Leeds, Nov 14 at 12. Bantoft, Selby.  
Gilbert, Daniel, Newark, Sussex, Coal Dealer. Pet Oct 20. Lewes,  
Nov 14 at 11. Hillman, Lewes.  
Goacher, Jas, Burton-upon-Trent, Stafford, Brewer's Clerk. Pet Oct  
22. Burton-upon-Trent, Nov 14 at 1. Wilson, Lichfield.  
reennall, Thos, Southport, Lancaster, out of business. Pet Oct 22.  
Manch, Nov 6 at 11. Partington & Allen, Manch.  
Gregg, Wm, jun, Birm, Provision Dealer. Pet Oct 20. Birm, Nov 7  
at 12. Southall & Nelson, Birm.  
Gregory, Mary, Stourport, Worcester, Rope Manufacturer. Pet Oct  
23. Birm, Nov 9 at 12. James & Griffin, Birm.  
Grugory, Sarah, Oppenham, Wilts, Innkeeper. Pet Oct 20. Bristol,  
Nov 7 at 11. Rawings, Melksham.  
Haines, Thos, Gt Catworth, Huntingdon, Butcher. Pet Oct 19.  
Thrapston, Nov 7 at 11. Richardson, Thrapston.  
Hart, Robt Wm, Prisoner for Debt, Lancaster. Adj Oct 17. Manch,  
Nov 8 at 11.  
Hawley, Thos, Palfrey, Walsall, Stafford, Stirrup Maker. Pet Oct 23.  
Walsall, Nov 7 at 11. Ebsworth, Wednesbury.  
Herbert, Geo, Farnborough, Hants, Warder at the Military Prison.  
Pet Oct 16. Farnham, Nov 12 at 12. White, Guildford.  
Hill, Benj, Prisoner for Debt, Walton. Pet Oct 15. Lpool, Nov 6 at  
3. Henry, Lpool.  
Hodgson, Jas Baxendale, and Joseph Horne, Walsfield, Drapers. Pet  
Oct 19. Leeds, Nov 8 at 11. Needham, Manch.  
Hollows, Levi, Prisoner for Debt, Lancaster. Adj Oct 16. Salford,  
Nov 10 at 9.30.  
Humphreys, Hy, jun, Fishmonger, Birm. Pet Oct 23 (for pau). Birm,  
Nov 7 at 12. James & Griffin, Birm.  
Inman, John, Lincoln, Flour Dealer. Pet Oct 22. Lincoln, Nov 8 at  
11. Tweed, Lincoln.  
James, Thos, Trillick, Pontypridd, Glamorgan, Licensed Victualler.  
Pet Oct 20. Pontypridd, Nov 7 at 3. Thomas, Pontypridd.  
Kendall, Mary Ann, Weston, York, Butter Factor. Pet Oct 18. Otley,  
Nov 3 at 11. Newstead, Otley.  
Kenny, Patrick Thos, Birm, out of business. Pet Oct 19 (for pau).  
Warwick, Nov 23 at 10.  
Kirk, Wm, Burnley, Lancaster, Cotton Manufacturer. Pet Oct 5.  
Manch, Nov 7 at 11. Marriot, Manch.  
Lewis, Wm, Lancaster, Fumbar. Pet Oct 20. Lancaster, Nov 5  
at 11. Peter, Lancaster.  
Lloyd, David, Prisoner for Debt, Brecknock. Adj Oct 10. Brecknock,  
Nov 7 at 11. James, Brecknock.  
Marsh, Jeremiah, Upper Gornal, Sedgley, Stafford, Journeyman  
Cooper. Pet Oct 19. Dudley, Nov 8 at 11. Lowe, Dudley.  
Morgan, Rees, Treccynon, Aberdare, Glamorgan, Grocer. Pet Oct 22.  
Aberdare, Nov 16 at 12. Simons, Merthyr Tydfil.  
Oddy, Isaac, Guiseley, York, Cloth Manufacturer. Pet Oct 17. Otley,  
Nov 3 at 11. Hartley, Otley.

Penny, Wilson, Lpool, Surveyor. Pet Oct 22. Lpool, Nov 6 at 11.  
Harris, Lpool.  
Pooley, Fredk, Manningtree, Essex, Coach Maker. Pet Aug 18. Col-  
chester, Nov 3 at 11.30. Jones, Colchester.  
Pope, Thos, Prisoner for Debt, Lancaster. Adj Oct 5. Manch, Nov 6  
at 9.30. Kay, Manch.  
Potts, Ferdinand, Birm, Tube Manufacturer. Pet Oct 25. Birm, Nov  
12 at 12. Webb, Birm.  
Rodrigues, Joseph, Prisoner for Debt, Lancaster. Adj Oct 17. Lpool,  
Nov 16 at 11.  
Scourfield, Wm, Llanelly, Carmarthen, out of business. Pet Oct 11.  
Swansea, Nov 8 at 11. Morris, Swansea.  
Simmons, Thos, Bloxwich, Stafford, Boatman. Pet Oct 23. Walsall,  
Nov 7 at 11. Duignan & Co, Walsall.  
Smith, Saml, Lpool, Wholesale Outfitter. Pet Oct 23. Lpool, Nov 6  
at 11. Bremner, Lpool.  
Soole, John Hy, Grays, Essex, Assistant to a Chemist. Pet Oct 18.  
Gravesend, Nov 5 at 12. Dobie, Basinghall-st.  
Sweeney, Saml, Leicester, Licensed Victualler. Pet Oct 24. Birm,  
Nov 13 at 11. Petty, Leicester.  
Thomas, Benj, Cwmabula, nr Swansea, Licensed Victualler. Pet Oct  
23. Swansea, Nov 7 at 2. Morris, Swansea.  
Vickers, Matthew, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Comm Agent. Pet Oct 24.  
Newcastle, Nov 10 at 10. Bousfield, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.  
Walker, David, Hanley, Stafford, Shingler. Pet Oct 24. Hanley, Nov  
17 at 11. Sutton, Burslem.  
Wheeler, Wm, Birm, out of business. Pet Oct 23 (for pau). Birm,  
Nov 9 at 12. James & Griffin, Birm.  
Whitworth, Squire, Lincoln, out of business. Pet Oct 22. Lincoln,  
Nov 12 at 11. Rex, Lincoln.  
Wilding, Wm Pilkington, & Joseph Lawson Strachan, Preston, Lan-  
caster Cotton Spinners. Pet Oct 24. Manch, Nov 29 at 12. Atkin-  
son & Co, Manch.  
Wood, Wm, Sheffield, Joiner. Pet Oct 22. Sheffield, Nov 8 at 1.  
Chambers & Waterhouse, Sheffield.

TUESDAY, Oct 30, 1866.

#### To Surrender in London.

Aldridge, John Thos, sen, Prisoner for Debt, Maidstone. Adj Oct 22.  
Nov 21 at 11. Aldridge.  
Barker, John, Abbott's Roosting-hall Farm, Essex, Farmer. Pet Oct  
25. Nov 17 at 11. Lewis & Lewis, Ely-pl.  
Barkham, Eliza, Prisoner for Debt, Winchester. Adj Oct 19. Nov 21  
at 11. Aldridge.  
Bentley, John, North-st, Bethnal-green, Bootmaker. Pet Oct 25. Nov  
14 at 2. Briant, Old Broad-st.  
Branscombe, John, Single Wh-st, Hoxton, Timber Merchant. Pet Oct  
22. Nov 21 at 12. Nicholson, Moorgate-st.  
Channing, Thos, Britannia-st, City-rd, Coffee-house Keeper. Pet Oct  
26. Nov 17 at 1. Dobie, Basinghall-st.  
Collier, Geo, Prisoner for Debt, Winchester. Adj Oct 19. Nov 21 at  
11. Aldridge.  
Collins, Fras, Baxter-rd, Islington, Sorter in the General Post Office.  
Pet Oct 26. Nov 14 at 2. Beard, Basinghall-st.  
Crewell, Abraham Van, Cannon-st-rd, St George's-in-the-East, Skin  
Dealer. Pet Oct 26. Nov 17 at 11. Ring, Basinghall-st.  
Fancourt, Hy John, Judd-st, New-rd, Mercantile Clerk. Pet Oct 26.  
Nov 12 at 2. Wyatt, Gt James-st, Bedford-row.  
Farris, Hy, Brindley-st, Harrow-rd, of no occupation. Pet Oct 26.  
Nov 12 at 2. Woodbridge & Sons, Clifford's-inn.  
Fisher, Thos, Furse, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Oct 25 (for pau).  
Nov 17 at 12. Pattison, Bedford-row.  
Franks, Wm, Baldoek, Hertfordshire, Dealer in Cattle. Pet Oct 25.  
Nov 17 at 12. Hanslip, Gt James-st, Bedford-row.  
Gray, Fredk Warwick, Birkenhead, Cheshire, Banker's Clerk. Pet Oct  
26. Nov 14 at 2. Daniels & Co, Fore-st.  
Hawgood, Saml, Fountain Public House, Lambeth-walk, Licensed  
Victualler. Pet Oct 27. Nov 14 at 2. White, Danes'-inn, Strand.  
Henshaw, Edmd Simons, Mark-lane, Fenchurch-st, Wine and Spirit  
Merchant. Pet Oct 25. Nov 17 at 1. Philby, Fenchurch-buildings.  
Horne, Hy, Winchester, Southampton, Builder. Pet Oct 25. Nov 17  
at 12. White, Danes'-inn, Strand.  
Jouanneau, Adolphe Thos, Cab Proprietor. Pet Oct 26. Nov 15 at 11.  
Hanslip, Gt James-st.  
Joyner, Geo, Ryde, Isle of Wight, Plumber and Glazier. Adj Oct 19.  
Nov 21 at 11. Aldridge, Moorgate-st.  
Locke, Chas, Poplar-row, New Kent-rd, Tinman. Pet Oct 27. Nov 21  
at 12. Hall, Coleman-st.  
Makepeace, Thos, Glaston-st, North Woolwich, Timekeeper. Pet  
Oct 25. Nov 17 at 12. Kerry, Gray's-inn-sq.  
Marshall, Chas, Epsom, Surrey, Fishmonger. Pet Oct 26. Nov 17 at  
1. Michael, Barge-yd, Bucklersbury.  
Musgrave, Wm, Prisoner for Debt, Maidstone. Adj Oct 22. Nov 21 at  
11. Aldridge.  
Older, Vincent Edwin, Hove, Sussex, Schoolmaster. Pet Oct 25. Nov  
17 at 12. Mardall, Brighton.  
Parr, Chas, Prisoner for Debt, Winchester. Adj Oct 19. Nov 21 at 11.  
Aldridge.  
Phillips, Edw West, Holloway-rd, out of business. Pet Oct 23. Nov  
17 at 11. Earle, Charles-sq, Hoxton.  
Readwin, Wm Ranson, Denbigh-st, Pimlico, Glass Writer. Pet Oct 20.  
Nov 17 at 11. Evans, John-st, Bedford-row.  
Reed, John, Rye, Sussex, Licensed Victualler. Pet Oct 26. Nov 17 at  
1. Cooke & Talbot, Raymond's-buildings, Gray's-inn.  
Salomons, Albert Lionel Harwitz, Leinster-sq, Bayswater. Pet Oct 25.  
Nov 17 at 11. Lewis & Lewis, Ely-pl.  
Stevens, Jas Edwd, Norfolk-ter, Westbourne-grove, Dairy Company's  
Clerk. Pet Oct 27. Nov 21 at 12. Croft, Montpellier-row, South  
Lambeth.  
Wenden, John, Everilda-st, Islington, Artist in Stained Glass. Pet  
Oct 27. Nov 21 at 12. Steadman, Mason's-avenue, Coleman-st.

#### To Surrender in the Country.

Adams, Amos, Winchcomb, Gloucester, Licensed Victualler. Pet Oct  
25. Bristol, Nov 9 at 11. Plumb, Winchcomb.  
Beath, Alfred, Portsea, Southampton, Whitesmith. Pet Oct 24. Ports-  
mouth, Nov 22 at 11. Stening, Portsea.  
Beverley, Wm Bell, Uleby, Lincoln, Bootmaker. Pet Oct 27. Barton-  
on-Humber, Nov 13 at 11. Nowell & Priestley.

Bisset, John, Chesterfield, Derby, Surgeon. Pet Oct 27. Leeds, Nov 10 at 12. Fretson, Sheffield.  
 Bunn, Fredk, Castlemorton, Worcester, Farmer. Pet Oct 27. Birm, Nov 12 at 12. Reece & Harris, Birm.  
 Calvert, Wm, Keighley, York, Gardener. Pet Oct 26. Keighley, Nov 10 at 10. Harle, Leeds.  
 Cartwright, Robt, West Gorton, nr Manch, Paper Stainer. Pet Oct 27. Manch, Nov 12 at 11. Marsland & Addleshaw, Manch.  
 Clark, John, Prisoner for Debt, Maidstone. Adj Oct 22. Maidstone, Nov 13 at 2.  
 Cotes, Wm, Nantwich, Chester, Auctioneer. Pet Oct 25. Lpool, Nov 12 at 12. Best, Lpool.  
 Cox, Wm, Northampton, Artist. Pet Oct 26. Northampton, Nov 10 at 10. White, Northampton.  
 Davey, Geo, Drypool, Kingston-upon-Hull, Butcher. Pet Oct 25. Kingston-upon-Hull, Nov 10 at 11. Summers, Hull.  
 Dorrington, Robt Alfred, Barrow-in-Furness, Lancaster, Steamboat Contractor. Pet Oct 18. Ulverston, Nov 5 at 10. Relph, Barrow.  
 Fielding, John, Fergus, Paddock, York, Watchman. Pet Oct 24. Huddersfield, Nov 25 at 10. Dransfield, Huddersfield.  
 Fraser, John, Southampton, Draper. Pet Oct 26. Southampton, Nov 14 at 12. Mackey, Southampton.  
 Greenhalgh, Thos, Prisoner for Debt, Lancaster. Pet Oct 19. Manch, Nov 9 at 12. Cooper & Sons, Manch.  
 Grey, Robt, Warkworth, Northumberland, Grocer. Pet Oct 27. Alnwick, Nov 12 at 11. Busby, Alnwick.  
 Hallwood, Wm, Leigh, Lancaster, Labourer. Pet Oct 27. Leigh, Nov 14 at 1. Ambler, Chawent.  
 Harrison, Geo, Stockport, Chester, Plumber. Pet Oct 26. Manch, Nov 12 at 12. Fletcher, Manch.  
 Haywood, John, Sheffield, Licensed Victualler. Pet Oct 29. Leeds, Nov 10 at 12. Sugg, Sheffield.  
 Hazell, Chas, Elvetnam, Southampton, Farm Bailiff. Pet Oct 25. Basingstoke, Nov 6 at 12. Chandler, Basingstoke.  
 Holmes, John, Barrow-in-Furness, Lancaster, Journeyman Joiner. Pet Oct 22. Ulverston, Nov 12 at 10. Relph, Barrow.  
 Howe, Edwin Silas, Manch, Professor of Music. Pet Oct 26. Manch, Nov 20 at 9.30. Leigh, Manch.  
 Jessopp, Fras Johnson, Derby, Attorney-at-Law. Pet Oct 26. Birm, Nov 13 at 11.  
 Matley, Abraham, Gorton, nr Manch, Bricksetter. Pet Oct 20 (for paup). Manch, Nov 20 at 9.30. Law, Manch.  
 Mossop, Thos, Lancaster, Grocer. Pet Oct 27. Manch, Nov 13 at 12. Cobbett & Wheeler, Manch.  
 Park, Richd, Easby, York, Corn Miller. Pet Oct 27. Leeds, Nov 19 at 11. Robinson, Richmond.  
 Penistan, Joseph, Prisoner for Debt, Devon. Adj Oct 27. Exeter, Nov 12 at 12.30. Hirtzel, Exeter.  
 Porry, Thos, Fallings Heath, Wednesbury, Miner. Pet Oct 25. Walsall, Nov 12 at 12. Sheldon, Wednesbury.  
 Phillips, John, Cwrtanov, Glamorgan, Grocer. Pet Oct 19. Bristol, Nov 9 at 9. Miller, Bristol.  
 Preece, Chas, Worcester, Sawyer. Pet Oct 24. Worcester, Nov 13 at 11. Deveroux, Worcester.  
 Quint, Wm John, East Stonehouse, Devon, Carpenter. Pet Oct 25. Exeter, Nov 12 at 12.30. Greenway & Fox, Plymouth.  
 Rees, Wm, Tenby, Pembroke, Bootmaker. Pet Oct 27. Pembroke, Nov 14 at 9. Hulm, Pembroke.  
 Rees, Edw, Pyes, Lpool, out of business. Pet Oct 27. Lpool, Nov 16 at 3. Webster, Lpool.  
 Revis, John, Nottingham, Baker. Pet Oct 25. Nottingham, Nov 23 at 11. Cowley & Everall, Nottingham.  
 Roberts, Wm, Holywell, Flint, Saddler. Pet Oct 20. Holywell, Nov 9 at 11. Davies, Holywell.  
 Rowley, John, Wellington, Salop, Ironstone Miner. Pet Oct 25. Wellington, Nov 16 at 10. Taylor, Wellington.  
 Savage, Augustus, Eccles, Lancaster, Salesman. Pet Oct 26. Salford, Nov 10 at 9.30. Shipman, Manch.  
 Sellers, Fredk, Hawmarsh, York, Wine Merchant. Pet Oct 27. Leeds, Nov 10 at 12. Chambers & Waterhouse, Sheffield.  
 Smith, Robt Hy, Clifton, Bristol, Gas Engineer. Pet Oct 25. Bristol, Nov 23 at 12. Price.  
 Smith, Saral, Lpool, Wholesale Outfitter. Pet Oct 23. Lpool, Nov 12 at 11. Bremner, Lpool.  
 Sproat, Robt, South Stockton, York, Pattern Maker. Pet Oct 26. Stockton-on-Tees, Nov 9 at 11. Clemmet, jun, of Stockton.  
 Stewart, Colin McDougal, Prisoner for Debt, Lancaster. Pet Oct 26. Lpool, Nov 9 at 11. Forshaw, Lpool.  
 Turpin, Joseph, Brightlinges, Essex, Licensed Victualler. Pet Oct 23. Colchester, Nov 10 at 11.30. Jones, Colchester.  
 Unwin, John, Pendleton, nr Manch, Commercial Traveller. Pet Oct 27. Manch, Nov 19 at 11. Law, Manch.  
 Warburton, Wm, Prisoner for Debt, York. Pet Oct 20. Bradford, Nov 9 at 9.45. Harle, Bradford.  
 Wood, John, Halifax, York, Mason. Pet Oct 26. Halifax, Nov 16 at 10. Jubb, Halifax.  
 Yeatman, Marsden, Wimbome Minster, Dorset, Carpenter. Pet Oct 24. Wimbome Minster, Nov 9 at 11. Tanner, Wimbome Minster.

**PHILLIPS & COMPANY'S TEAS ARE BEST AND CHEAPEST. STRONG TO FINE BLACK TEA.** 1s. 6d., 2s., 2s. 6d., 3s., 3s. 6d. Most Delicious Black Tea is now only 3s. 6d. per pound. Pure, Rich, Rare, Choice Coffee, 1s. 4d., 1s. 6d., 1s. 8d. PHILLIPS & CO., TEA MERCHANTS, 8, King William-street, City, London, E.C.

A price current free. Sugars at market prices. PHILLIPS & CO. send all goods Carriage Free within eight miles No. 8, King William-street; 40s. worth Carriage Free to any Railway Station or Market Town in England. Phillips & Co. have no agents, nor any connexion with any house in Worcester or Swansea.

**TIDMAN'S SEA SALT**, the Substitute for Sea Bathing.—Astonishing results are effected by its daily use in rheumatism, sprains, weakness, &c. For weakly infants it is the best strengthener extant. Sold by all chemists and druggists, in bags and boxes of 7lb., 14lb., 28lb., 56lb., and 1 cwt.—N.B. Particularly see that each package bears the words, "Tidman's Sea Salt."

## GRESHAM LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY,

37, OLD JEWRY, LONDON, E.C.

SOLICITORS are invited to introduce, on behalf of their clients, Proposals for Loans on Freehold or Leasehold Property, Reversions, Life Interests, or other adequate securities.

Proposals may be made in the first instance according to the following form:—

### PROPOSAL FOR LOAN ON MORTGAGES.

Date.....  
 Introduced by (state name and address of solicitor)  
 Amount required £  
 Time and mode of repayment (i. e., whether for a term certain, or by annual or other payments)  
 Security (state shortly the particulars of security, and, if land or buildings, state the net annual income)  
 State what Life Policy (if any) is proposed to be effected with the Gresham Office in connexion with the security.

By order of the Board,

F. ALLAN CURTIS, Actuary and Secretary.

**LAW ALMANACK, 1867.**—Now Publishing, by HORATIO OCKERBY (late Wm. Harrison), Law Stationer, &c., 95, Chancery-lane, W.C. Will be ready for issue on and after the 20th of November next.

"London Gazette" (published by authority) and London and Country Advertisement Office, No. 119, Chancery-lane, Fleet Street.

**HENRY GREEN** (many years with the late George Reynell), Advertisement Agent, begs to direct the attention of the Legal Profession to the advantages of his long experience of upward of twenty years, in the special insertion of all pro forma notices, &c., and hereby solicits their continued support.—N.B. One copy of advertisement only required, and the strictest care and promptitude assured.

## FIRST CLASS SUNDAY PAPER.—THE

OBSERVER, established 1791, contains the fullest notice of every event of importance that occurs on the Saturday, together with a complete epitome of the news of the previous days. For the latest official and telegraphic information, as well as for original articles on every subject of public interest, The Observer has always been distinguished. It can be obtained in the country by the early trains on Sunday morning. Price, unstamped, 5d.; stamped, 6d.—Office, 170, Strand.

## BROOKS & SCHALLER (removed from Piccadilly)

—The INDEX, printed MONTHLY (first published in 1820), of ESTATES, Country and Town Houses, Manors, Hunting Quarters, Shootings and Fishings, Farms, &c., to be LET or SOLD, can be had (free) at their Offices, 25, Charles-street, St. James's, S.W., opposite the Junior United Service Club. Particulars inserted without charge, but for next publication must be forwarded before the 24th of each month.

## SLACK'S SILVER ELECTRO PLATE is a coat-

ing of pure Silver over Nickel. A combination of two metals possessing such valuable properties renders it in appearance and wear equal to Sterling Silver.

	Fiddle Pattern.		Thread.		King's.	
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Table Forks, per doz.....	1 10 0	and 1 18 0	2 8 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	3 0 0
Dessert ditto .....	1 0 0	and 1 10 0	1 15 0	2 2 0	2 2 0	2 2 0
Table Spoons .....	1 10 0	and 1 18 0	2 8 0	3 0 0	3 0 0	3 0 0
Dessert ditto .....	1 0 0	and 1 10 0	1 15 0	2 2 0	2 2 0	2 2 0
Tea Spoons .....	0 12 0	and 0 18 0	1 3 6	1 10 0		

Every Article for the Table as in Silver. A Sample Tea Spoon forwarded on receipt of 20 stamps.

RICHARD & JOHN SLACK, 336, STRAND, LONDON.

## SLACK'S FENDER AND FIRE-IRON WARE-

HOUSE is the MOST ECONOMICAL, consistent with good quality:—Iron Fenders, 3s. 6d.; Bronzed ditto, 4s. 6d., with standards; superior Drawing-room ditto, 14s. 6d. to 50s.; Fire Irons, 2s. 6d. to 20s. Patent Dish Covers, with handles to take off, 18s. set of six. Table Knives and Forks, 8s. per dozen. Roasting Jacks, complete, 7s. 6d. Tea-trays, 6s. 6d. set of three; elegant Papier Maché ditto, 25s. the set. Teapots, with plated knob, 5s. 6d.; Coal Scuttles, 2s. 6d. A set of Kitchen Utensils for cottage, £3. Slack's Cutlery has been celebrated for 50 years. Ivory Table Knives, 14s., 16s., and 18s. per dozen. White Bone Knives and Forks, 8s. 9d. and 12s.; Black Horn ditto, 8s. and 10s. All warranted.

As the limits of an advertisement will not allow of a detailed list, purchasers are requested to send for their Catalogue, with 350 drawings, and prices of Electro-Plate, Warranted Table Cutlery, Furnishing Ironmongery, &c. May be had gratis or post free. Every article marked in plain figures at the same low prices for which their establishment has been celebrated for nearly 50 years. Orders above £2 delivered carriage free per rail.

RICHARD & JOHN SLACK, 336, STRAND, LONDON, Opposite Somerset House.

## TO SOLICITORS, &c., requiring DEED BOXES,

will find the best-made article lower than any other house. Lists of Prices and sizes may be had gratis or sent post free.

RICHARD & JOHN SLACK, 336, Strand, opposite Somerset House. Established nearly 50 years. Orders above £2 sent carriage free.

## THE SMOKER'S BONBON immediately and

effectually removes the Taste and Smell of Tobacco from the Mouth and Breath, and renders Smoking agreeable and safe. It is very pleasant and wholesome. Prepared by a patent process, from the recipe of an eminent physician, by SCHOOLING & Co., Wholesale and Export Confectioners, Bethnal-green, London. One Shilling per box; post free, 14 stamps.—Sold by Chemists, Tobacconists, &c.



## NATIONAL PROVINCIAL BANK OF ENGLAND, BISHOPSGATE STREET, CORNER OF THREADNEEDLE STREET.

The Directors beg to give notice, that the following BRANCHES of this Establishment are NOW OPEN for the transaction of Banking Business:—

St. James's Branch, at No. 14, Waterloo Place, Pall Mall.  
Marylebone Branch, at No. 28, Baker Street. Islington Branch, at No. 173, Upper Street.

A. ROBERTSON, } Joint General Managers.  
E. ATKINSON, }

## NATIONAL PROVINCIAL BANK OF ENGLAND

(ESTABLISHED IN THE YEAR 1833).

OPENED for the transaction of Banking Business in LONDON, on the 10th JANUARY, 1866, at the HEAD OFFICE, BISHOPSGATE STREET, CORNER OF THREADNEEDLE STREET.

SUBSCRIBED CAPITAL, £2,100,000. PAID-UP CAPITAL, £1,080,000. RESERVED FUND, £236,012 4s.  
NUMBER OF SHAREHOLDERS . . . . . 1,905

### THE NATIONAL PROVINCIAL BANK OF ENGLAND

Having numerous branches in England and Wales, as well as agents and correspondents at home and abroad, affords great facilities to parties transacting banking business with it in London.

Customers keeping accounts with the Bank in town may have moneys paid to their credit at its various Branches, and remitted free of charge.

CURRENT ACCOUNTS are conducted at the Head Office and London Branches on the usual terms of London Banks.

DEPOSITS at INTEREST are received of sums of £10 and upwards, for which receipts are granted, called Deposit Receipts, and Interest is allowed according to the value of money, from time to time, as advertised by the Bank in the Newspapers.

The AGENCY of COUNTRY and FOREIGN BANKS, whether joint-stock or private, is undertaken.

PURCHASES and SALES are effected in all British and Foreign Stocks; and Dividends, Annuities, &c., received for Customers.

CIRCULAR NOTES are now ready for issue and can be obtained on application.

The OFFICERS of the BANK are bound to secrecy as regards the transactions of its Customers.

COPIES of the 33rd ANNUAL REPORT of the Bank, Lists of Shareholders, Branches, Agents, and Correspondents, may be had on application at the Head Office, and at the Branches.

By order of the Directors,

A. ROBERTSON, } Joint General Managers.  
E. ATKINSON, }

### DEBENTURES at 5, 5½, and 6 per Cent.

CEYLON COMPANY LIMITED.

SUBSCRIBED CAPITAL £750,000.

#### DIRECTORS.

Chairman—LAWFORD ACLAND, Esq.

Major-General Henry Pelham  
Burn.  
Harry George Gordon, Esq.  
George Ireland, Esq.

Duncan James Kay, Esq.  
Stephen P. Kennard, Esq.  
Patrick F. Robertson, Esq., M.P.  
Robert Smith, Esq.

#### MANAGER.

C. J. BRAINE, Esq.

The Directors are prepared to ISSUE DEBENTURES on the following terms, viz., for 1 year at 5 per Cent., for 3 years at 5½ per Cent., and for 5 years and upwards at 6 per Cent. per annum.

Applications for particulars to be made at the Office of the Company, No. 7, East India-avenue, Leadenhall-street, London, E.C.

By Order,

R. A. CAMERON, Secretary.

#### SIX PER CENT. DEBENTURES.

**THE COUNTY AND GENERAL GAS CONSUMERS' COMPANY (Limited)** are prepared to receive OFFERS in sums of £20 and upwards for LOANS in DEBENTURES bearing interest at the rate of 6 per cent. per annum and repayable in three, five, or seven years. Interest payable half-yearly.

Full particulars may be obtained on application at the offices of the Company, 9, St. Benet-place, Gracechurch-street, London.

October, 1866.

By order of the Board,

R. S. PARKER, Secretary.

### LAND and HOUSE INVESTMENT SOCIETY (Limited).

Capital £100,000.—The Directors are prepared to receive APPLICATIONS for LOANS on DEBENTURES, in sums of not less than £50, for terms of one year and upwards, for which interest at the rate of six per cent. will be paid half-yearly.

These debentures are secured on the freehold estates and other property of the Society, and the issue is limited to the amount of the uncalled capital.

Applications to be made to the undersigned.

No. 22, Charing-cross, S.W. ALFRED W. HEWER, Secretary.

### THE RENT GUARANTEE SOCIETY,

Established 1850. Capital £100,000.

Owners of Property travelling, or having special engagements to meet, can have a portion of their Rents remitted or paid to their credit on fixed days without extra charge.

Office, 3, Charlotte-row, Mansion House.

#### LOANS ON DEBENTURES.

### JOHN CROSSLEY AND SONS (LIMITED), HALIFAX.

CAPITAL SUBSCRIBED.....£1,650,000  
Do. PAID UP.....£1,092,390  
Do. RESERVE FUND.....£11,384

The Directors of the above Company are prepared to RECEIVE LOANS on Debentures for periods of not less than one, or more than five years; to bear interest at five per cent. per annum. The interest on sums from £10 to £100 will be paid yearly, say on the 5th of July; the interest on sums exceeding £100 will be paid half yearly, say on the 5th of January and on the 5th of July.

Loans for periods of longer or shorter dates than the above will be subject to special arrangement.

Apply personally, or by letter, to Mr. BENJAMIN MUSGRAVE, Dean Clough Mills, Halifax.

### TRELOAR.

### KAMPTULICON MANUFACTURER.

### NO. 67, LUDGATE-HILL.

**MR. ROBINS**, of 5, Waterloo-place, Pall-mall, S.W. (established in the Piazza, Covent-garden, 1780), has for SALE by PRIVATE CONTRACT, several extremely desirable LANDED ESTATES, also upwards of 100 lots of Freehold and Leasehold House Property, Ground-rents, &c., including many very sound and eligible Investments. A list sent post-free. Money required on mortgage, in sums of various amount, on good securities.—Address as above.

#### BY ROYAL COMMAND.

METALLIC PEN MAKER TO THE QUEEN.

**JOSEPH GILLOTT** respectfully directs the attention of the Commercial Public, and of all who use Steel Pens, to the incomparable excellence of his productions, which for Quality of Material, Easy Action, and Great Durability, will ensure universal preference.

They can be obtained, retail, of every dealer in the world; wholesale, at the Works, Graham-street, Birmingham; 91, John-street, New York; and at 37, Gracechurch-street, London.

### TO EXECUTORS AND OTHERS.—Plate, Gold

Trinkets, and Diamonds bought for the full value in cash by J. PARKER, Jeweller and Watchmaker, 45, Southampton-row, Bloomsbury. Established 1836.